arXiv:1702.01349v1 [stat.ME] 4 Feb 2017

Estimating Average Treatment Effects with a Response-Informed Calibrated Propensity Score

David Cheng[1], Abhishek Chakrabortty[2], Ashwin N. Ananthakrishnan[3], and Tianxi Cai[1]

[1]Department of Biostatistics, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health
[2]Department of Statistics, University of Pennsylvania
[3]Division of Gastroenterology, Massachusetts General Hospital

Abstract

Approaches based on propensity score (PS) modeling are often used to estimate causal treatment effects in observational studies. The performance of inverse probability weighting (IPW) and doubly-robust (DR) estimators deteriorate under model mis-specification or when the dimension of covariates that are adjusted for is not small. We propose a response-informed calibrated PS approach that is more robust to model mis-specification and accommodates a large number of covariates while preserving the double-robustness and local semiparametric efficiency properties under correct model specification. Our approach achieves additional robustness and efficiency gain by estimating the PS using a two-dimensional smoothing over an initial parametric PS and another parametric response score. Both of the scores are estimated via regularized regression to accommodate covariates with a dimension that is not small. Simulations confirm these favorable properties in finite samples. We illustrate the method by estimating the effect of statins on colorectal cancer risk in an electronic medical record study and the effect of smoking on C-reactive protein in the Framingham Offspring Study.

Keywords: Causal inference; double-robustness; electronic medical records; kernel smoothing; regularized estimation; semiparametric efficiency.

1 Introduction

While randomized clinical trials (RCT) remain the gold standard for evaluating the effects of a treatment, large scale observational studies (OS) are valuable sources of data that complement RCT. Among the benefits is the accumulation of large samples in broad patient populations, which enables inferences about treatment effects in subgroups not available in RCT. But drawing conclusions about treatment effects with OS is challenging. In the absence of randomization, naive contrasts between treatment groups may exhibit substantial bias for the treatment effect. Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983) showed that adjusting for the propensity score (PS), the conditional probability of assignment to a treatment group $T \in \{0, 1\}$ given a p dimensional covariate vector $\boldsymbol{X}$, can remove such bias provided that $\boldsymbol{X}$ satisfies *strong ignorability*. Methods for estimating treatment effects based on the PS $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{X}) = P(T = 1|\boldsymbol{X})$, typically estimated from the data, have since become widespread. The inverse probability weighting (IPW) estimator (Horvitz and Thompson, 1952; Rosenbaum, 1987) is one of the common approaches that weights responses based on $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{X})$. The doubly-robust (DR) estimator (Robins et al., 1994) augments an IPW estimator by a term involving a model for the conditional mean of the response Y given T and $\boldsymbol{X}$ to improve its efficiency. It achieves the semiparametric efficiency bound when both the PS and response models are correctly specified. The DR estimator is doubly-robust in that it is consistent when either the PS or response model is correctly specified (Scharfstein et al., 1999).

A principal concern of PS methods is that $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{X})$ is often estimated from mis-specified parametric models, which can lead to severe bias (Drake, 1993; Kang and Schafer, 2007). Nonparametric models for $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{X})$ (Hirano et al., 2003; McCaffrey et al., 2004) are rarely used in practice due to the curse of dimensionality and difficulties in implementation. Since the true PS balances covariate distributions between treatments, some recent methods proposed robust estimates of the PS or other weights that can be used for causal inference by direct balancing of the covariate empirical moments (Imai and Ratkovic, 2014; Zubizarreta, 2015). Some work along these lines resemble calibration estimators in survey sampling (Hainmueller, 2011; Chan et al., 2015). The performance of these methods appears to be excellent in settings with few covariates but is unclear when p is not small relative to the sample size n. The DR estimator is more robust than methods relying only on the PS, but, despite its double-robustness, mis-specification of the response model results in efficiency loss.

A second concern of equal if not greater importance is variable selection for PS models, particularly when p is not small. Suppose that $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{X})$ and the conditional mean of the

counterfactual responses $\{Y^{(1)}, Y^{(0)}\}$ given a $\boldsymbol{X}$ satisfying strong ignorability depend only on $\boldsymbol{X}_{\mathcal{J}^\pi}$ and $\boldsymbol{X}_{\mathcal{J}^\mu}$ respectively, where $\boldsymbol{X}_{\mathcal{J}}$ denotes the sub-vector of $\boldsymbol{X}$ indexed by $\mathcal{J}$. It is sufficient to adjust only for $\boldsymbol{X}_{\mathcal{J}^\pi}$ to identify the counterfactual means. Adjusting for additional covariates in $\mathcal{J}^\mu$ improves efficiency of PS-based estimators (Lunceford and Davidian, 2004; Brookhart et al., 2006). Asymptotically, adjusting for more covariates than those in $\mathcal{J}^\pi$ will potentially gain efficiency and adjusting for the entire $\boldsymbol{X}$ using the DR estimator achieves semiparametric efficiency under correct model specifications even if a subset of $\boldsymbol{X}$ does not belong to $\mathcal{J}^\pi \cup \mathcal{J}^\mu$. However, in finite samples, such an exhaustive "over-modeling" approach (Perkins et al., 2000; Rubin and Thomas, 1996) may lead to instability in estimation and efficiency loss. It is thus desirable to incorporate variable selection into the PS and/or response models, which has been recently proposed by various authors to improve estimation of causal effects. Screening covariates based on marginal associations between the treatment and response (Schneeweiss et al., 2009; Hirano and Imbens, 2001) may be mis-leading because marginal associations need not agree with conditional associations. Bayesian model averaging provides a principled approach to PS variable selection (Zigler and Dominici, 2014) but relies on restrictive parametric assumptions and encounters burdensome computations when p is large. Farrell (2015) proposed a penalized version of the DR estimator by imposing regularization for both the PS and response models in the large p setting. However, the validity of the influence function expansion for the estimated treatment effect requires correct specification of both models. Belloni et al. (2013) proposed to estimate $\mathcal{J}^\pi \cup \mathcal{J}^\mu$ via regularization while allowing $\boldsymbol{X}$ to include a large number of non-linear transformations of the original observed covariates and then estimate the treatment effect by fitting a linear response model given the selected covariates. Wilson and Reich (2014) considered estimating $\mathcal{J}^\pi \cup \mathcal{J}^\mu$ via a regularized loss function for estimates from initial treatment and response models and then re-fitting the response model with selected covariates, primarily focusing on the case of continuous exposures. These two approaches rely on a response model to estimate the treatment effect and may produce biased estimators if the model is mis-specified.

The problems of model mis-specification and variable selection are especially relevant in modern OS due to the large number of variables collected and the complex, largely unknown relationships among them. Studies based on electronic medical records (EMRs) or claims data can easily have hundreds or thousands of covariates available on patients' medical histories and current health. Modern cohort studies also collect information on a large number of clinical, questionnaire, and/or genetic variables. Non-linearities and interactions

among such covariates are often expected in these contexts, and yet there is usually limited subject matter knowledge to provide adequate guidance for manual model building or feature selection. To address these issues and overcome limitations of existing methods, we propose an IPW estimator based on a response-informed calibrated PS (RiCaPS) where we estimate the PS in two steps: (1) obtain initial estimates of the PS and a response score, defined as the linear predictors based on the covariates from a response model, as a bivariate parametric score of $\boldsymbol{X}$, and (2) calibrate the initial PS by a nonparametric estimate of the probability of treatment assignment given the bivariate score in (1). The response score in (1) can be viewed as a working prognostic score (Hansen, 2008a). We employ regularization throughout to stabilize estimates and perform variable selection as in some of the aforementioned methods. The additional calibration in (2) distinguishes our method from existing methods with respect to both robustness and efficiency gain. We show that the RiCaPS IPW estimator also achieves double-robustness and local semiparametric efficiency. It maintains additional robustness and efficiency benefits beyond that of standard DR methods when the initial PS and response models are mis-specified and when p is not small relative to n. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. We set up the notation and causal inference framework in Section 2.1. In Sections 2.2-2.4 we describe estimating the calibrated PS and examine the properties of an IPW estimator based the RiCaPS. A perturbation resampling procedure is proposed in Section 2.5 for interval estimation. We present simulation results showing the robustness and efficiency of RiCaPS in Section 3 and applications to estimating treatment effects in an EMR study with few covariates and in the Framingham Offspring Study (FOS) with a large number of covariates in Section 4. We conclude with some remarks in Section 5. Regularity conditions and proofs are deferred to the Supplementary Materials.

2 Method

2.1 Data and Framework

Let $Y \in \mathbb{R}$ denote a response that can be modeled by a generalized linear model (GLM), such as a binary, ordinal, or continuous response , $T \in \{0, 1\}$ a binary treatment, and $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathcal{X}$ a $p+1$-dimensional vector of bounded covariates that includes 1 as its first element. We consider p to be fixed but potentially not small relative to n. The observed data consists of n independent and identically distributed (iid) observations $\mathscr{D} = \{\boldsymbol{Z}_i \equiv (Y_i, T_i, \boldsymbol{X}_i^\intercal)^\intercal :$

$i = 1, \ldots, n\}$. Let $Y^{(1)}$ and $Y^{(0)}$ denote the counterfactual outcomes (Rubin, 1974) had an individual received treatment or control. Based on $\mathscr{D}$, we want to make inferences about the average treatment effect:

$$\Delta = E(Y^{(1)}) - E(Y^{(0)}) = \mu_1 - \mu_0. \tag{1}$$

For identifiability, we require the following standard causal inference assumptions.

$$Y = TY^{(1)} + (1-T)Y^{(0)} \tag{2}$$

$$(Y^{(1)}, Y^{(0)}) \perp T|\boldsymbol{X} \tag{3}$$

$$\pi_k(\boldsymbol{x}) \equiv P(T = k|\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{x}) \in (0,1) \text{ for } k = 0,1 \text{ when } f(\boldsymbol{x}_{[-1]}) > 0 \tag{4}$$

where $f(\boldsymbol{x}_{[-1]})$ is the joint density for $\boldsymbol{X}_{[-1]}$, and $\boldsymbol{x}_{[-1]}$ denotes the subvector of $\boldsymbol{x}$ excluding the first element. Under these assumptions, Δ can be identified from the g-formula (Robins, 1986):

$$\Delta = E\{\mu(1, \boldsymbol{X}) - \mu(0, \boldsymbol{X})\} = E\left\{\frac{I(T=1)Y}{\pi_1(\boldsymbol{X})} - \frac{I(T=0)Y}{\pi_0(\boldsymbol{X})}\right\}$$

where $\mu(k, \boldsymbol{X}) = E(Y|\boldsymbol{X}, T = k)$, for $k = 0, 1$.

2.2 Parametric Working Models

To estimate Δ from $\mathscr{D}$, we consider the following two parametric *working* models for $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{X})$ and $\mu(T, \boldsymbol{X})$, either of which could be correct or mis-specified:

$$\text{Model } \mathcal{M}_\pi : \pi_1(\boldsymbol{X}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^\pi) = g_\pi(\boldsymbol{X}^\mathsf{T}\boldsymbol{\beta}^\pi) \tag{5}$$

$$\text{Model } \mathcal{M}_\mu : \mu(T, \boldsymbol{X}; \beta_T^\mu, \boldsymbol{\beta}^\mu) = g_\mu(T\beta_T^\mu + \boldsymbol{X}^\mathsf{T}\boldsymbol{\beta}^\mu) \tag{6}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}^\pi, \boldsymbol{\beta}^\mu \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1}$, $\beta_T^\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ are unknown regression parameters, and $g_\pi(\cdot)$ and $g_\mu(\cdot)$ are specified smooth link functions. The initial PS estimated from fitting $\mathcal{M}_\pi$ will be calibrated by smoothing T over both estimated scores $\boldsymbol{X}^\mathsf{T}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\pi$ and $\boldsymbol{X}^\mathsf{T}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\mu$. The response score $\boldsymbol{X}^\mathsf{T}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\mu$ will serve to inform the calibration. We estimate the parameters in $\mathcal{M}_\pi$ and $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ using regularized estimators that minimize penalized likelihood functions:

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\pi &= \underset{\boldsymbol{\beta}^\pi}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n -\ell_\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta}^\pi; T_i, \boldsymbol{X}_i) + p_n^\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{[-1]}^\pi) \right\} \\
(\widehat{\beta}_T^\mu, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu\mathsf{T}})^\mathsf{T} &= \underset{\beta_T^\mu, \boldsymbol{\beta}^\mu}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n -\ell_\mu\left\{(\beta_T^\mu, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mu\mathsf{T}})^\mathsf{T}; \boldsymbol{Z}_i\right\} + p_n^\mu\left\{(\beta_T^\mu, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{[-1]}^{\mu\mathsf{T}})^\mathsf{T}\right\} \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $\ell_\pi(\boldsymbol{\beta}^\pi; \boldsymbol{Z}_i)$ and $\ell_\mu(\beta_T^\mu, \boldsymbol{\beta}^\mu; \boldsymbol{Z}_i)$ are the log-likelihood contributions of the i-th observation and $p_n^\pi(\cdot)$ and $p_n^\mu(\cdot)$ are penalty functions chosen such that the *oracle* properties (Fan and Li, 2001) hold. Examples of such estimators include the adaptive least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (LASSO) (Zou, 2006) with initial weights estimated from ridge regression. The oracle properties enable regularization procedures to potentially select all covariates in $\mathcal{J}^\pi$ for the PS model and covariates only in $\mathcal{J}^\mu$ for the response model. This preserves the ignorability of treatment assignment under assumption (3) during adjustment with the PS while selecting out irrelevant covariates that would promote efficiency loss. Regularization also stabilizes estimates, which also results in efficiency gains.

2.3 Response-Informed Calibrated Propensity Score

To guard against model mis-specifications, our proposed RiCaPS estimator calibrates an initial PS estimated from $\mathcal{M}_\pi$ based on smoothing T over the estimated scores $\widehat{\boldsymbol{S}} = \boldsymbol{M}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}\boldsymbol{X}$:

$$\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{x}; \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \frac{n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^n K_h\left\{\boldsymbol{M}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}(\boldsymbol{X}_j - \boldsymbol{x})\right\} I(T_j = k)}{n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^n K_h\left\{\boldsymbol{M}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}(\boldsymbol{X}_j - \boldsymbol{x})\right\}} = \frac{n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^n K_h(\widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}_j - \widehat{\boldsymbol{s}}) I(T_j = k)}{n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^n K_h(\widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}_j - \widehat{\boldsymbol{s}})} \tag{8}$$

for $k = 0, 1$, where $\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}^\pi, \boldsymbol{\beta}^\mu)^\mathsf{T}$ for $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\pi\mathsf{T}}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mu\mathsf{T}})^\mathsf{T}$, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{s}} = \boldsymbol{M}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}\boldsymbol{x}$, $K_h(\boldsymbol{u}) = h^{-2}K(\boldsymbol{u}/h)$ and $K(\cdot)$ is a bivariate q-th order kernel function with $q > 2$. The bandwidth h is chosen such that $n^{1/2}h^q + n^{-1/2}h^{-2} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, which is possible when $q > 2$. More discussions on h are given in the Discussion section. Smoothing over the PS direction calibrates the initial PS estimates toward the true PS under mis-specification of $\mathcal{M}_\pi$. Smoothing over the response direction could produce efficiency gain by leveraging information from covariates in $\mathcal{J}^\mu$ but not in $\mathcal{J}^\pi$. This smoothing approach addresses the dilemma of whether to take an exhaustive variable selection strategy so as to capture all covariates in $\mathcal{J}^\pi \cup \mathcal{J}^\mu$ or a more conservative strategy to avoid unstable estimates when selecting covariates for the PS model. Applying regularization to the PS model by itself would discard information from efficiency covariates in $\mathcal{J}^\mu$, which is avoided by smoothing over the response direction. A monotone transformation can be applied to $\widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}$ prior to smoothing to improve finite sample performance (Wand et al., 1991). In our numerical studies, we applied a standard normal cumulative distribution function transformation after standardizing the scores to obtain approximately uniformly distributed scores and scaled a component so that a common bandwidth h can be used for both components of the score.

2.4 RiCaPS IPW Estimator

With the PS estimated by $\widehat{\pi}(\boldsymbol{x};\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$, we now consider an IPW estimator for Δ defined by:

$$\widehat{\Delta} = \widehat{\mu}_1 - \widehat{\mu}_0, \text{ where } \widehat{\mu}_k = \frac{n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\omega}_{ik} Y_i}{n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\omega}_{ik}} \text{ and } \widehat{\omega}_{ik} = \frac{I(T_i = k)}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})} \text{ for } k = 0, 1 \tag{9}$$

To present our main result on the asymptotic expansion for $\widehat{\Delta}$, let $\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = (\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi\mathsf{T}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu\mathsf{T}})^{\mathsf{T}}$ be the limit of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, $\bar{\boldsymbol{S}} = \boldsymbol{M}_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}\boldsymbol{X}$, $\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X};\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = P(T = k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}})$, and:

$$\bar{\Delta} = \bar{\mu}_1 - \bar{\mu}_0, \text{ where } \bar{\mu}_k = E(\bar{\omega}_{ik} Y_i) \text{ and } \bar{\omega}_{ik} = \frac{I(T_i = k)}{\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}, \text{ for } k = 0, 1$$

Regardless of the adequacy of working models, we establish in Appendix B of the Supplementary Materials the following result.

Theorem 1. *Let $\widehat{W}_k = n^{1/2}(\widehat{\mu}_k - \bar{\mu}_k)$ for $k = 0, 1$ so that $n^{1/2}(\widehat{\Delta} - \bar{\Delta}) = \widehat{W}_1 - \widehat{W}_0$. Then under the causal assumptions (2), (3), (4) and the regularity conditions detailed in Appendix A of the Supplementary Materials, $\widehat{W}_k$ has the expansion:*

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{W}_k = n^{-1/2}\sum_{i=1}^n \Big[(Y_i^{(k)} - \bar{\mu}_k) + (\bar{\omega}_{ik} - 1)\Big\{Y_i^{(k)} - E(Y_i|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i, T_i = k)\Big\}\Big] \\ + n^{1/2}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})^{\mathsf{T}}\boldsymbol{v}_k^{\mu} + n^{1/2}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi})^{\mathsf{T}}\boldsymbol{v}_k^{\pi} + O_p(n^{1/2}h^q + n^{-1/2}h^{-2})\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $\boldsymbol{v}_k^{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}_k^{\pi}$ are deterministic vectors, for $k = 0, 1$. When the PS model $\mathcal{M}_{\pi}$ holds, $\boldsymbol{v}_0^{\mu} = \boldsymbol{v}_1^{\mu} = \boldsymbol{0}$. When both $\mathcal{M}_{\pi}$ and the response model $\mathcal{M}_{\mu}$ hold, we also have that $\boldsymbol{v}_0^{\pi} = \boldsymbol{v}_1^{\pi} = \boldsymbol{0}$.

Thus, under $\mathcal{M}_{\pi}$, estimating the response model does not contribute extra variability to the asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\Delta}$. This form of the asymptotic expansion is analogous to that of the standard DR estimator in general and exactly identical when both $\mathcal{M}_{\pi}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\mu}$ hold. In addition to the root-n convergence rate, the asymptotic expansion yields two important asymptotic properties that the RiCaPS IPW estimator shares with the DR estimator: double-robustness and local semiparametric efficiency. Specifically, we have the following two corollaries.

Corollary 1. *Under the assumptions required for Theorem 1 and a bandwidth $h = O(n^{-\alpha})$ for $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2q}, \frac{1}{4})$, when either the PS model $\mathcal{M}_{\pi}$ or response model $\mathcal{M}_{\mu}$ is correctly specified, $\widehat{\Delta} - \Delta = O_p(n^{-1/2})$.*

Corollary 2. *Under the assumptions required for Theorem* 1 *and a bandwidth* $h = O(n^{-\alpha})$ *for* $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2q}, \frac{1}{4})$*, if both models* $\mathcal{M}_\pi$ *and* $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ *hold, then* $\widehat{\Delta}$ *achieves the semiparametric efficiency bound under a model correctly specified by* $\mathcal{M}_\pi$*.*

Compared to the standard DR estimator, the RiCaPS IPW estimator enjoys additional robustness and efficiency benefits. By weighting with a calibrated PS, $\widehat{\Delta}$ uses PS estimates that better approximate the true PS under mis-specification of $\mathcal{M}_\pi$. Asymptotically, $\widehat{\pi}_1(\boldsymbol{x}; \widehat{\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}})$ converges uniformly in $\boldsymbol{x}$ to $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{x}; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$, which coincides with the true PS $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{x})$ under $\mathcal{M}_\pi$ and otherwise is a conditional probability of treatment assignment closer to $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{x})$ than the parametric limiting estimate $g_\pi(\boldsymbol{x}^\mathsf{T}\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\pi)$ when $\mathcal{M}_\pi$ is incorrect. We expect this calibration to make $\widehat{\Delta}$ more robust to bias from mis-specification of the PS model. In some cases, this calibration can substantially if not completely overcome mis-specification of the PS model. For example, $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{x}; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ still coincides with the true PS $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{x})$ if $\pi_1(\boldsymbol{x})$ follows a single-index model (SIM) and $\boldsymbol{X}$ is elliptically distributed such that $E(\boldsymbol{X}^\mathsf{T}\boldsymbol{b}|\boldsymbol{X}^\mathsf{T}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\pi)$ is linear in $\boldsymbol{X}^\mathsf{T}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\pi$, for any $\boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1}$, with $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\pi$ being the true coefficients in the SIM, owing to the results of Li and Duan (1989). This implies that the RiCaPS IPW can be consistent even when $\mathcal{M}_\pi$ is mis-specified up to the link and $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ is arbitrarily mis-specified. Incidentally, if the true response model follows a SIM such that $\mu(T, \boldsymbol{X}) = g_0^\mu(\beta_{T,0}^\mu T + \boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\mu)$ for some smooth link function $g_0^\mu(\cdot)$ and some $\beta_{T,0}^\mu \in \mathbb{R}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\mu \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1}$ and $\boldsymbol{X}$ is elliptically distributed, then the results of Li and Duan (1989) hold approximately for $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\mu$. As a result, when $\mathcal{M}_\pi$ is arbitrarily mis-specified and $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ is mis-specified up to the link, $\widehat{\Delta}$ can potentially still be approximately consistent for Δ.

The term $(\bar{\omega}_{ik} - 1)\left\{Y_i^{(k)} - E(Y_i|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i, T_i = k)\right\}$ in (10) reveals potential benefits in terms of asymptotic efficiency. The efficient influence function for Δ in a semiparametric model under $\mathcal{M}_\pi$ is $\Psi^{\text{eff}} = \Psi_1^{\text{eff}} - \Psi_0^{\text{eff}}$ where $\Psi_k^{\text{eff}} = Y^{(k)} - \mu_k + (\omega_k - 1)\left\{Y^{(k)} - \mu(k, \boldsymbol{X}\right\}$, with $\omega_k = I(T = k)/\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X})$, for $k = 0, 1$ (Tsiatis, 2007). The conditional expectation $\mu(k, \boldsymbol{X}) = E(Y|\boldsymbol{X}, T = k)$ can be viewed as an orthogonal projection of $Y^{(k)}$ onto the space of real-valued measurable functions of $\boldsymbol{X}$ with finite second moments. The term $(\omega_k - 1)\left\{Y^{(k)} - \mu(k, \boldsymbol{X})\right\}$ is a projection of $(\omega_k - 1)Y^{(k)}$, which consequently has lower variance than $(\omega_k - 1)Y^{(k)}$ itself. The DR estimator attains Ψ^{eff} as its influence function under both $\mathcal{M}_\pi$ and $\mathcal{M}_\mu$. Under $\mathcal{M}_\pi$ but mis-specified $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ the influence function of the DR estimator takes the form $Y^{(k)} - \mu_k + (\omega_k - 1)\left\{Y^{(k)} - \xi(k, \boldsymbol{X})\right\}$ where $\xi(k, \boldsymbol{X})$ is some projection onto a subspace that does not contain $\mu(k, \boldsymbol{X})$. For the RiCaPS IPW, the corresponding projection is driven by a projection of $\mu(k, \boldsymbol{X})$ onto a larger subspace of measurable functions of $\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}$ with finite second moments, which contributes to efficiency gain. The DR and RiCaPS

IPW estimators differ slightly in how estimating $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\pi}$ contributes to the asymptotic variance, and it is difficult to compare their asymptotic efficiencies analytically. However, simulation evidence suggests that the RiCaPS IPW achieves substantial efficiency gain compared to the DR estimator. An additional important feature of the RiCaPS is the efficiency gains in finite samples when p is not small relative to n. As discussed above, in such scenarios routine maximum likelihood estimators for $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\pi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mu}$ become unstable and produces subsequent instability in the IPW and DR estimators. Smoothing to calibrate the initial PS estimate stabilizes the estimates by adjusting them toward the true PS. The use of regularization to estimate both $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\pi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mu}$ further stabilizes the estimates while selecting the relevant covariates, which produces additional efficiency gains.

2.5 Perturbation Resampling

The asymptotic variance for $n^{1/2}(\widehat{\Delta} - \bar{\Delta})$, which can be determined from (10), needs to be estimated to construct confidence intervals (CIs). But because the expansion involves complex unknown functionals, a direct empirical estimate is challenging. We instead propose a simple perturbation-resampling procedure similar to that proposed in (Cai et al., 2010). Let $\mathcal{G} = \{G_i : i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ be non-negative iid random variables with mean and variance equal to 1 that are independent of $\mathscr{D}$. The perturbation procedure perturbs each layer of estimation in the RiCaPS IPW. First each i-th observation in the loss functions for the regularized estimators from (7) is weighted by G_i. The weighted loss is minimized to obtain the perturbed estimators $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi *}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu *}$. The perturbed RiCaPS are calculated by:

$$\widehat{\pi}_k^*(\boldsymbol{x}; \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^*) = \frac{n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^n K_h(\widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}_i^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{s}}^*) I(T_j = k) G_j}{n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^n K_h(\widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}_i^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{s}}^*) G_j}$$

for $k = 0, 1$, where $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^* = (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi *\mathsf{T}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu *\mathsf{T}})^{\mathsf{T}}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{s}}^* = \boldsymbol{M}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^*}\boldsymbol{x}$. The perturbed RiCaPS IPW is:

$$\widehat{\Delta}^* = \widehat{\mu}_1^* - \widehat{\mu}_0^*, \text{ where } \widehat{\mu}_k^* = \frac{n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\omega}_{ik}^* Y_i G_i}{n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\omega}_{ik}^* G_i} \text{ and } \widehat{\omega}_{ik}^* = \frac{I(T_i = k)}{\widehat{\pi}_k^*(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^*)} \text{ for } k = 0, 1$$

The asymptotic distribution of $n^{1/2}(\widehat{\Delta} - \bar{\Delta})$ coincides with that of $n^{1/2}(\widehat{\Delta}^* - \widehat{\Delta})$ given $\mathscr{D}$. Generating a sample of $\widehat{\Delta}^*$'s with different $\mathcal{G}$'s approximates the distribution for $\widehat{\Delta}$. The variance of $\widehat{\Delta}$ can be estimated, for example, from the sample variance or mean absolute deviation (MAD) of the $\widehat{\Delta}^*$'s. We may construct CIs using a normal approximation or the

empirical quantiles of the $\widehat{\Delta}^*$'s. When using a non-robust method to estimate the standard error (SE) or other functionals, the perturbed samples may need to be trimmed to protect against the effect of outliers.

3 Simulation Studies

We performed extensive simulations to assess the finite sample properties of our proposed RiCaPS IPW estimator compared to that of existing PS-based IPW estimators, including those using the true PS (True PS), PS estimated from logistic regression (GLM PS), PS estimated from adaptive LASSO logistic regression (ALAS PS), the DR estimator (DR), and a DR estimator using LASSO to estimate the PS and response models (LAS DR) that is akin to Farrell (2015). For the RiCaPS estimator, we use adaptive LASSO to estimate $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and a Gaussian product kernel of order $q = 4$ with a plug-in bandwidth at the optimal order (see Discussion) in the smoothing unless noted otherwise. For all regularized estimators, we chose tuning parameters based on a modified BIC criterion that replaces $log(n)$ by $\min\{n^{\cdot 1}, log(n)\}$ to avoid excessive shrinkage in finite samples. For working models in all methods, we let $g_\pi(u) = 1/\{1 + \exp(-u)\}$ in $\mathcal{M}_\pi$ and $g_\mu(u) = u$ in $\mathcal{M}_\mu$. We focused on a continuous response in the simulations, where the data were generated according to:

$$\boldsymbol{X} \sim N\left\{\mathbf{0}, 0.8\boldsymbol{I}_p + 0.2\right\}, \quad T|\boldsymbol{X} \sim Ber\left\{\pi_1(\boldsymbol{X})\right\}, \quad \text{and} \qquad Y|T, \boldsymbol{X} \sim N\left\{\mu(T, \boldsymbol{X}), 10^2\right\},$$

Covariates shared by both $\pi(\boldsymbol{X})$ and $\mu(T, \boldsymbol{X})$ induce bias in estimators of the marginal association between T and Y for causal effects. We considered sample sizes $n = 500, 1000$ and 2000 and $p = 10, 30, 50$ and 100 but only present representative subsets of the results for conciseness. Results are summarized based on 5000 replications for each setting unless noted otherwise.

In a first set of simulations we considered the empirical bias, root mean square error (RMSE), and relative efficiency (RE) compared to the DR estimator. We varied the simulations over three model specification scenarios: (A) Both $\mathcal{M}_\pi$ and $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ are correct, (B) $\mathcal{M}_\pi$ holds but $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ is mis-specified with the true $\mu(T, \boldsymbol{X})$ generated from a double-index model (DIM), and (C) $\mathcal{M}_\pi$ is mis-specified with the true $\pi(\boldsymbol{X})$ generated from a DIM but

$\mathcal{M}_\mu$ holds. Specifically, in these three scenarios, we set:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(A) \quad \mu(T, \boldsymbol{X}) = \beta_T^\mu T + \boldsymbol{X}\mathsf{T}\boldsymbol{\beta}^\mu, && \pi_1(\boldsymbol{X}) = g_\pi(\boldsymbol{X}^\mathsf{T}\boldsymbol{\beta}^\pi) \\
&(B) \quad \mu(T, \boldsymbol{X}) = \beta_T^\mu T + \boldsymbol{X}^\mathsf{T}\boldsymbol{\beta}_{[1]}^\mu(.5\boldsymbol{X}^\mathsf{T}\boldsymbol{\beta}_{[2]}^\mu + .5), && \pi_1(\boldsymbol{X}) = g_\pi(\boldsymbol{X}^\mathsf{T}\boldsymbol{\beta}^\pi) \\
&(C) \quad \mu(T, \boldsymbol{X}) = \beta_T^\mu T + \boldsymbol{X}\mathsf{T}\boldsymbol{\beta}^\mu, && \pi_1(\boldsymbol{X}) = g_\pi\left\{\boldsymbol{X}^\mathsf{T}\boldsymbol{\beta}_{[1]}^\pi(.5\boldsymbol{X}^\mathsf{T}\boldsymbol{\beta}_{[2]}^\pi + .5)\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\beta_T^\mu = 1$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}^\mu = (0, 1, 1.4, 1, \mathbf{.5}_{3\times1}^\mathsf{T}, \mathbf{-1}_{3\times1}^\mathsf{T}, -1.5, \mathbf{0}_{(p-10)\times1}^\mathsf{T})^\mathsf{T}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}^\pi = (0, .25, 0, \mathbf{.25}_{7\times1}^\mathsf{T}, \mathbf{0}_{(p-9)\times1}^\mathsf{T})^\mathsf{T}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{[1]}^\mu = (1, 0, 1, 0, .5, 0, -.5, 0, -1, 0, \mathbf{0}_{(p-10)\times1}^\mathsf{T})^\mathsf{T}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{[2]}^\mu = (0, .7, 0, .7, 0, .7, 0, .7, 0, .7, \mathbf{0}_{(p-10)\times1}^\mathsf{T})^\mathsf{T}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{[1]}^\pi = (.6, 0, .6, 0, .6, 0, .6, 0, .6, 0, \mathbf{0}_{(p-10)\times1}^\mathsf{T})^\mathsf{T}$, and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{[2]}^\pi = (0, .4, 0, .4, 0, -.4, 0, -.4, 0, -.4, \mathbf{0}_{(p-10)\times1}^\mathsf{T})^\mathsf{T}$. We used orthogonal indices in the DIMs so that SIMs cannot provide a close approximation.

Table 1 presents the bias and RMSE for $n = 500, 2000$ under the different model specification scenarios when $p = 10$. The bias for RiCaPS is small across all these scenrios. In larger samples when $n = 2000$, the small amount of bias exhibited by RiCaPS is diminishing to zero and is negligible, demonstrating its double-robustness. As expected, GLM PS and ALAS PS incur substantial biases that do not diminish in large samples when $\mathcal{M}_\pi$ is mis-specified. RiCaPS, DR, and LAS DR have similar RMSE either when both models are correct or only the response model is correct. In large samples when both $\mathcal{M}_\pi$ and $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ are correct, all three estimators have asymptotic variances that approach the semiparametric variance bound. When $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ is mis-specified, RiCaPS achieves a lower RMSE than all other competing IPW estimators.

Figure 1 shows the RE for $n = 500, 2000$ across increasing p and mis-specification scenarios. When $n = 500$ and both $\mathcal{M}_\pi$ and $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ are correct, RiCaPS achieves substantial efficiency gains over DR as p increases. In this scenario GLM PS exhibits favorable efficiency relative to True PS when p is small, illustrating the efficiency paradox where estimating the PS yields efficiency gain even when the PS is known (Lunceford and Davidian, 2004). But as p increases, this efficiency gain from estimating the PS via GLM is lost due to the instability of the estimated PS. DR also suffers a similar efficiency loss due to instability in estimating the nuisance parameters when p is not small relative to n. ALAS PS, which employs regularization to stabilize the PS estimates, shows favorable efficiency when p is large. However ALAS PS may incur substantial bias if the PS model is incorrect and is inefficient because it may select out covariates in $\boldsymbol{X}_{\mathcal{J}^\mu}$. LAS DR achieves some efficiency gain over DR when p is not small relative to n and models are correctly specified but does not gain as much as RiCaPS. In large samples when both $\mathcal{M}_\pi$ and $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ are correct, RiCaPS, LAS DR, and DR are all similar due to the semiparametric efficiency bound, whereas the other estimators are not fully efficient. When $\mathcal{M}_\pi$ is mis-specified, RiCaPS, LAS DR, and

		$\mathcal{M}_\pi$ and $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ Correct		Mis-specified $\mathcal{M}_\mu$		Mis-specified $\mathcal{M}_\pi$	
	Estimator	**Bias**	**RMSE**	**Bias**	**RMSE**	**Bias**	**RMSE**
$n = 500$	True PS	0.001	0.443	0.007	0.430	0.003	0.542
	GLM PS	0.002	0.365	0.007	0.437	0.260	0.497
	ALAS PS	0.015	0.365	0.021	0.422	0.187	0.453
	DR	0.002	0.343	0.006	0.435	0.005	0.384
	LAS DR	0.003	0.343	0.007	0.436	0.005	0.383
	RiCaPS	0.018	0.342	0.025	0.368	0.055	0.375
$n = 2000$	True PS	-0.002	0.227	-0.002	0.215	0.004	0.276
	GLM PS	-0.002	0.177	-0.002	0.214	0.258	0.325
	ALAS PS	0.001	0.182	0.002	0.211	0.192	0.280
	DR	-0.001	0.168	-0.002	0.212	0.000	0.181
	LAS DR	-0.001	0.168	-0.002	0.212	0.000	0.181
	RiCaPS	0.009	0.168	0.011	0.179	0.021	0.176

Table 1: Empirical bias and RMSE of IPW estimators for $n = 500, 2000$, $p = 10$ and by model specification scenarios.

DR have comparable performances in large samples, but RiCaPS gains the most when p is not small relative to n. When $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ is mis-specified, RiCaPS achieves 41%-64% greater efficiency than DR LAS and DR in large and and small samples, suggesting the calibration step in RiCaPS leads to additional efficiency gain.

We also evaluated the performance of SE and CI estimation based on perturbation when both models are correct for $p = 10, 30$. When estimating the SEs, we considered both MAD and also robust estimation by removing outliers more than 5 MADs away from the median. We estimated the 95% CIs using the .025 and .975 quantiles of the perturbed samples. As shown in Table 2, the average of the estimated SEs are close to the empirical SEs for both choices of the SE estimators. The empirical coverage levels of the CIs are close to the nominal level. The performance of SE and CI estimation is expected to weaken with larger p for a fixed n, but these results suggest the performance is reasonable when p is not too large.

(a) Correctly Specified Models



(b) Mis-specified Models



Figure 1: RE of various IPW estimators estimated relative to DR for $n = 500$ and 2000 when (a) both models are correct with varying p; and (b) either the response model or the PS model is mis-specified with $p = 50$.

4 Applications

4.1 Effect of Statins on Colorectal Cancer Risk with EMR Data

We applied the RiCaPS IPW to assess the effect of statins, a medication for lowering cholesterol levels, on the risk of colorectal cancer (CRC) in patients with inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) identified from the EMRs of a large metropolitan healthcare provider. Previous studies have suggested that use of statins have a protective effect on CRC (Liu

		Average	ESE	$\text{ASE}_{\text{robust}}$	ASE_{MAD}	Coverage
$p = 10$	$n = 500$	1.026	0.332	0.321	0.310	0.959
	$n = 1000$	1.008	0.246	0.223	0.220	0.925
$p = 30$	$n = 500$	1.017	0.357	0.331	0.318	0.952
	$n = 1000$	1.016	0.242	0.225	0.222	0.944

Table 2: Average estimates, empirical SE (ESE), average of the estimated SE (ASE) based on either the robust estimate or the MAD, and coverage for 95% CIs with 1000 datasets and 1000 perturbations per dataset.

et al., 2014). Few studies have considered this potential effect among IBD patients. The EMR cohort consisted of $n = 10,817$ IBD patients. The CRC status and statin use were ascertained by the presence of ICD9 diagnosis codes and electronic prescriptions, respectively. We adjusted for $p = 15$ baseline covariates that were potential confounders, including age, gender, race, smoking status as assessed via natural language processing (NLP), indication of elevated inflammatory markers, examination with colonoscopy, use of biologics and immunomodulators, subtypes of IBD, disease duration, and presence of primary sclerosing cholangitis (PSC). Our goal was to estimate the average treatment effect of statin use on CRC risk.

We specified $g_\mu(\cdot)$ to be the logistic link to accommodate the binary response when implementing RiCaPS. Estimators based on competing methods are also obtained for comparison. When selecting tuning parameters for the regularized estimators, the modified BIC criterion for binary response replaces $log(n)$ by $\min\{(\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i)^{\cdot 1}, log(\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i)\}$. The bootstrap was used to obtain SEs and CIs for competing methods. A two-sided p-value based on a Wald test for the null that statins have no effect was calculated based on the SEs. As shown in Table 3, all methods found a significant protective effect of statins. Without adjustment, the naive risk difference is estimated to be -0.8% with SE 0.4%. After adjusting for covariates, various IPW estimators have larger point estimates of around -2%, suggesting the protective effect. The point estimates from RiCaPS, LAS DR, and DR are similar but the RiCAPS estimator is estimated to be 33% more efficient than the DR and DR-LAS estimators.

	IBD EMR Study				*FOS*			
	Estimate	**SE**	**95% CI**	**p**	**Estimate**	**SE**	**95% CI**	**p**
None	-0.008	0.004	(-0.017, 0.000)	0.043	0.180	0.057	(0.064, 0.295)	<.001
GLM	-0.021	0.003	(-0.028, -0.015)	<.001	0.152	0.062	(0.029, 0.27)	0.014
ALAS	-0.021	0.003	(-0.028, -0.015)	<.001	0.130	0.055	(0.035, 0.26)	0.018
DR	-0.020	0.003	(-0.026, -0.015)	<.001	0.147	0.061	(0.032, 0.265)	0.017
LAS DR	-0.020	0.003	(-0.026, -0.015)	<.001	0.140	0.058	(0.032, 0.254)	0.016
RiCaPS	-0.024	0.002	(-0.029, -0.019)	<.001	0.120	0.054	(0.023, 0.257)	0.026

Table 3: Estimated treatment effect along with SE, quantile based 95% CIs, and wald test p-value for the effect of statins on CRC risk in EMR data and the effect of smoking on logCRP in FOS data.

4.2 Framingham Offspring Study

The FOS is a cohort study initiated in 1971 that enrolled 5,124 adult children and spouses of the original Framingham Heart Study. The study collected data over time on participants' medical history, physician examination, and laboratory tests to examine epidemiological and genetic risk factors of cardiovascular disease (CVD). A subset of the FOS participants also have their genotype from the Affymetrix 500K SNP array available through the Framingham SNP Health Association Resource (SHARe) on dbGaP. We were interested in assessing the effect of smoking on C-reactive protein (CRP), an inflammation marker highly predictive of CVD risk, while adjusting for potential confounders including gender, age, diabetes status, use of hypertensive medication, systolic and diastolic blood pressure measurements, and HDL and total cholesterol measurements, as well as a large number of SNPs in gene regions previously reported to be associated with inflammation or obesity. While the inflmmation-related SNPs are not likely to be associated with smoking, we include them as efficiency covariates since they are likely to be related with CRP. SNPs that had missing values in $> 1\%$ of the sample as well as SNPs that had a correlation $> .99$ with other SNPs in the data were removed from the covariates. A small proportion of individuals who still had missing values in SNPs had their values imputed by the mean value. The analysis includes $n = 1,892$ individuals with available information on the CRP and the $p = 121$ covariates, of which 113 were SNPs.

We applied RiCaPS specifying $g_\mu(u) = u$ and selected the bandwidth via cross-validation. Because CRP is heavily skewed, we applied a log transformation so that the linear regression model better fits the data. Resampling was used in the same way as the previous example

to estimate standard errors, confidence intervals, and two-sided p-values for the null that smoking has no effect. As shown in Table 3, all results agree that smoking significantly increases logCRP. The point estimates are attenuated after adjusting for confounders since smokers are likely to have other characteristics that increase inflammation. The RiCaPS estimator is estimated to be 16% more efficient than the DR-LAS estimator.

5 Discussion

The proposed RiCaPS IPW estimator for the average treatment effect possesses the standard double robustness and semiparametric efficiency properties while allowing adjustment with covariates whose dimension is not small. We argued and demonstrated through siulations that the RiCaPS IPW achieves more robustness and efficiency gains than other IPW and DR estimators in some scenarios. For a given $\boldsymbol{X}$, the performance of the RiCaPS still relies on correct or approximately-correct specification of working models to achieve consistency and semiparametric efficiency, so the specification of these models is not unimportant. If both working models are grossly mis-specified, the RiCaPS may still exhibit poor performance along with the other estimators. The RiCaPS IPW, however, is more resilient to the impacts of mis-specification on consistency and efficiency. Throughout we rely on having available a $\boldsymbol{X}$ that satisfies the ignorability assumption in (3). Such an assumption is justified through subject matter knowledge and potentially could be more plausible when including a large number of covariates in $\boldsymbol{X}$. In such cases the proposed RiCaPS IPW is more advantageous than standard methods.

In our numerical studies, we selected the regularization tuning parameter via a modified BIC criterion for all regularized estimators for computational ease. However, cross-validation or other criteria could be used. In experiments not reported here, we found that IPW estimators depending on regularized estimates performed slightly differently when cross-validation was used but the relative performance of the RiCaPS of IPW estimators remained nearly the same. To obtain an appropriate bandwidth in the smoothing, we note that the dominating error terms in the expansion are $O_p(n^{1/2}h^q + n^{-1/2}h^{-2})$, which converges to 0 when $h = O(n^{-\alpha})$ for $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2q}, \frac{1}{4})$. The optimal bandwidth balances the two terms and is $h^* = O(n^{-1/(q+2)})$. In obtaining an exact bandwidth, cross-validation can be used to obtain an initial optimal bandwidth for the kernel smoothing itself $\widetilde{h}^* = O(n^{-1/(2q+2)})$ using conventional kernel smoothing software. An optimal bandwidth for the RiCaPS IPW can then be obtained by $\widehat{h}^* = \widetilde{h}^* \cdot n^{1/(2q+2)-1/(q+2)}$. Another approach is to use a plug-in

bandwidth $\widehat{h}^{plug} = \widehat{\sigma}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}_i} \cdot n^{-\alpha}$ where $\widehat{\sigma}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}_i}$ denotes the sample standard deviation of the components of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}_i$ (or its monotonic transformation) for $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2q}, \frac{1}{4})$. Though our asymptotic analysis does not account for data-dependent bandwidths, both these approaches appeared to work well in practice. We took the plug-in approach in most of the numerical studies for computational ease but advocate cross-validation for routine data analysis in datasets where n is not too large.

Our proposed estimator is expected to work when p increases slowly with n (e.g. at a low polynomial rate), although we have only considered the asymptotics for a fixed p. It is of interest to extend the theoretical results to the de-jure "high-dimensional" case when p varies with n. This procedure can also be extended to accommodate survival data.

References

Belloni, A., Chernozhukov, V., and Hansen, C. (2013). Inference on treatment effects after selection among high-dimensional controls. *The Review of Economic Studies*, page rdt044.

Brookhart, M. A., Schneeweiss, S., Rothman, K. J., Glynn, R. J., Avorn, J., and Stürmer, T. (2006). Variable selection for propensity score models. *American journal of epidemiology*, 163(12):1149–1156.

Cai, T., Tian, L., Uno, H., Solomon, S. D., and Wei, L. (2010). Calibrating parametric subject-specific risk estimation. *Biometrika*, 97(2):389–404.

Chan, K. C. G., Yam, S. C. P., and Zhang, Z. (2015). Globally efficient non-parametric inference of average treatment effects by empirical balancing calibration weighting. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*.

Drake, C. (1993). Effects of misspecification of the propensity score on estimators of treatment effect. *Biometrics*, pages 1231–1236.

Fan, J. and Li, R. (2001). Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 96(456):1348–1360.

Farrell, M. H. (2015). Robust inference on average treatment effects with possibly more covariates than observations. *Journal of Econometrics*, 189(1):1–23.

Hainmueller, J. (2011). Entropy balancing for causal effects: A multivariate reweighting method to produce balanced samples in observational studies. *Political Analysis*, page mpr025.

Hansen, B. B. (2008a). The prognostic analogue of the propensity score. *Biometrika*, 95(2):481–488.

Hansen, B. E. (2008b). Uniform convergence rates for kernel estimation with dependent data. *Econometric Theory*, 24(03):726–748.

Hirano, K. and Imbens, G. W. (2001). Estimation of causal effects using propensity score weighting: An application to data on right heart catheterization. *Health Services and Outcomes research methodology*, 2(3-4):259–278.

Hirano, K., Imbens, G. W., and Ridder, G. (2003). Efficient estimation of average treatment effects using the estimated propensity score. *Econometrica*, 71(4):1161–1189.

Horvitz, D. G. and Thompson, D. J. (1952). A generalization of sampling without replacement from a finite universe. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 47(260):663–685.

Imai, K. and Ratkovic, M. (2014). Covariate balancing propensity score. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 76(1):243–263.

Kang, J. D. and Schafer, J. L. (2007). Demystifying double robustness: A comparison of alternative strategies for estimating a population mean from incomplete data. *Statistical science*, pages 523–539.

Li, K.-C. and Duan, N. (1989). Regression analysis under link violation. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1009–1052.

Liu, Y., Tang, W., Wang, J., Xie, L., Li, T., He, Y., Deng, Y., Peng, Q., Li, S., and Qin, X. (2014). Association between statin use and colorectal cancer risk: a meta-analysis of 42 studies. *Cancer Causes & Control*, 25(2):237–249.

Lunceford, J. K. and Davidian, M. (2004). Stratification and weighting via the propensity score in estimation of causal treatment effects: a comparative study. *Statistics in medicine*, 23(19):2937–2960.

McCaffrey, D. F., Ridgeway, G., and Morral, A. R. (2004). Propensity score estimation with boosted regression for evaluating causal effects in observational studies. *Psychological methods*, 9(4):403.

Newey, W. K. and McFadden, D. (1994). Large sample estimation and hypothesis testing. *Handbook of econometrics*, 4:2111–2245.

Perkins, S. M., Tu, W., Underhill, M. G., Zhou, X.-H., and Murray, M. D. (2000). The use of propensity scores in pharmacoepidemiologic research. *Pharmacoepidemiology and drug safety*, 9(2):93–101.

Robins, J. (1986). A new approach to causal inference in mortality studies with a sustained exposure periodapplication to control of the healthy worker survivor effect. *Mathematical Modelling*, 7(9):1393–1512.

Robins, J. M., Rotnitzky, A., and Zhao, L. P. (1994). Estimation of regression coefficients when some regressors are not always observed. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 89(427):846–866.

Rosenbaum, P. R. (1987). Model-based direct adjustment. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 82(398):387–394.

Rosenbaum, P. R. and Rubin, D. B. (1983). The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika*, 70(1):41–55.

Rubin, D. B. (1974). Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of educational Psychology*, 66(5):688.

Rubin, D. B. and Thomas, N. (1996). Matching using estimated propensity scores: relating theory to practice. *Biometrics*, pages 249–264.

Scharfstein, D. O., Rotnitzky, A., and Robins, J. M. (1999). Adjusting for nonignorable drop-out using semiparametric nonresponse models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94(448):1096–1120.

Schneeweiss, S., Rassen, J. A., Glynn, R. J., Avorn, J., Mogun, H., and Brookhart, M. A. (2009). High-dimensional propensity score adjustment in studies of treatment effects using health care claims data. *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass.)*, 20(4):512.

Tsiatis, A. (2007). *Semiparametric theory and missing data*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Wand, M. P., Marron, J. S., and Ruppert, D. (1991). Transformations in density estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 86(414):343–353.

Wilson, A. and Reich, B. J. (2014). Confounder selection via penalized credible regions. *Biometrics*, 70(4):852–861.

Zigler, C. M. and Dominici, F. (2014). Uncertainty in propensity score estimation: Bayesian methods for variable selection and model-averaged causal effects. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 109(505):95–107.

Zou, H. (2006). The adaptive lasso and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American statistical association*, 101(476):1418–1429.

Zubizarreta, J. R. (2015). Stable weights that balance covariates for estimation with incomplete outcome data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110(511):910–922.

Supplementary Materials to "Estimating Average Treatment Effects with a Response-Informed Calibrated Propensity Score"

These supplementary materials derive the asymptotic expansion in Theorem 1 and its corollaries. We first specify some additional notation and list the assumptions, which, in addition to the causal assumptions discussed in the main article, are used throughout. We then establish some helpful lemmas. Finally, we derive the expansion of $\widehat{W}_k = \sqrt{n}(\widehat{\mu}_k - \bar{\mu}_k)$ for $k = 0, 1$ and verify the corollaries.

The following notations will facilitate the derivations. For a given $\boldsymbol{s} \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^{2(p+1)}$ and any covariate vector $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1}$, let:

$$\boldsymbol{S}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\boldsymbol{X}, \quad \boldsymbol{s}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\boldsymbol{x}, \quad \bar{\boldsymbol{S}} = \boldsymbol{S}_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}, \quad \bar{\boldsymbol{s}} = \boldsymbol{s}_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}, \quad \boldsymbol{x}^{\dagger} = [\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{0}_{(p+1)\times 1}], \quad \boldsymbol{x}^{\ddagger} = [\boldsymbol{0}_{(p+1)\times 1}, \boldsymbol{x}]$$
$$\bar{\pi}_1(\boldsymbol{s}) = P(T = 1 | \bar{\boldsymbol{S}} = \boldsymbol{s}), \quad \bar{\pi}_0(\boldsymbol{s}) = 1 - \bar{\pi}_1(\boldsymbol{s}), \quad \bar{\pi}_1(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}) = \pi_1(\boldsymbol{x}; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}),$$

$f(\boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ be the density function of $\boldsymbol{S}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ at $\boldsymbol{s}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, $\bar{f}(\boldsymbol{s})$ be the density function of $\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}$ at $\boldsymbol{s}$. Furthermore, we let:

$$l_k(\boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \pi_k(\boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta}) f(\boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta}), \quad \bar{l}_k(\boldsymbol{s}) = \bar{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{s}) \bar{f}(\boldsymbol{s}), \quad \bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}) = l_k(\boldsymbol{x}; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$$
$$\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta}) = n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n} K_h \left\{ \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\boldsymbol{X} - \boldsymbol{x}) \right\} I(T_j = k), \quad \widehat{f}(\boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta}) = n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n} K_h \left\{ \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\boldsymbol{X} - \boldsymbol{x}) \right\}$$

and note that $\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta}) \widehat{f}(\boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta})$, for $k = 0, 1$. We also let $\dot{K}(\boldsymbol{u}) = \partial K(\boldsymbol{u}) / \partial \boldsymbol{u}$, with $\dot{K}_h(\boldsymbol{x}) = h^{-3} \dot{K}(\boldsymbol{x}/h)$. To simplify the notation, let $\boldsymbol{V}_{ji} = \boldsymbol{V}_j - \boldsymbol{V}_i$ be the difference of any two vectors $\boldsymbol{V}_j$ and $\boldsymbol{V}_i$, and let $\sum_{i,j}$ denote the double sum $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n}$. Throughout we let:

$$a_n = h^q + \left\{ log(n)/(nh^2) \right\}^{1/2}$$

be the uniform convergence rate of a two-dimensional Nadaraya-Watson kernel estimator with a q-th order kernel Hansen (2008b).

A Assumptions

The following are mostly adopted from Hansen (2008b), which impose some standard smoothness and moment conditions on the underlying distributions, which are required for

the uniform convergence of the kernel smoothing estimators and bounding various terms in the expansion. Some additional requirements are also needed to address the estimated directions in the kernel smoothing. We assume throughout the following conditions. $K(\cdot)$ is a bivariate symmetric kernel function of order $q > 2$ with finite q-th moment. $K(\cdot)$ is bounded and continuously differentiable with compact support. The gradient of $K(\cdot)$ evaluated at $\boldsymbol{u}$, $\dot{K}(\boldsymbol{u})$, is bounded, integrable, and Lipshitz continuous. The covariate space $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{p+1}$ is compact. $\bar{f}(\boldsymbol{s})$ is bounded and bounded away from 0. $\bar{f}(\boldsymbol{s})$, $\bar{\pi}(\boldsymbol{s})$, and $E(Y|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}} = \boldsymbol{s}, T = k)$ for $k = 0, 1$ are q-times continuously differentiable. $E(\boldsymbol{X}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}} = \boldsymbol{s})$, $E(\boldsymbol{X}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}} = \boldsymbol{s}, T = k)$, and $E(\boldsymbol{X}Y|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}} = \boldsymbol{s}, T = k)$ are continuously differentiable for $k = 0, 1$.

B Proofs

B.1 Preliminary Results

The first lemma identifies the stochastic order of a standardized mean when the variance of its individual observations if of a known order. It will be useful for controlling terms that emerge from the V-statistic projection lemma (Newey and McFadden, 1994), which will be the primary tool used in the expansion.

Lemma 1. *Let $\{X_{i,n}\}$ be a triangular array such that $X_{1,n}, \ldots, X_{n,n}$ are iid for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that $\sigma_n^2 = Var(X_{i,n}) = O(c_n^2)$ for each n, where c_n is some positive deterministic sequence. Then:*

$$|n^{\frac{1}{2}}(\bar{X}_n - \mu_n)| \leq O_p(c_n)$$

where $\bar{X}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{i,n}$ and $\mu_n = E(X_{i,n})$.

Proof. From Chebychev's inequality, for any $k > 0$:

$$P\left\{|n^{\frac{1}{2}}(\bar{X}_n - \mu_n)/c_n| > k\right\} \leq \frac{\sigma_n^2}{c_n^2 k^2}$$

Let $M = \sup_n \sigma_n^2/c_n^2$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, we obtain the desired result by taking $k = (M/\epsilon)^{1/2}$. □

The next lemma simplifies the average of the gradients of the inverse RiCaPS with respect to $\boldsymbol{\beta}^\pi$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^\mu$, evaluated at $\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$. Terms of this form will appear multiple times when identifying the contributions to the expansion from estimating $\boldsymbol{\beta}^\pi$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^\mu$.

Lemma 2. *Let $g : \mathbb{R}^{p+3} \to \mathbb{R}$ be some real-valued square-integrable transformation of the data $\boldsymbol{Z}$. Under assumptions listed above and additionally that $E\left\{g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i)|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i = \boldsymbol{s}\right\}$ and $E\left\{\boldsymbol{X}_i g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i)|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i = \boldsymbol{s}\right\}$ are continuous in $\boldsymbol{s}$:*

$$n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\pi\intercal}}\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^{-1}g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) = E\left[\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\intercal}\left\{1-\frac{I(T_j=k)}{\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}\right\}\frac{g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i)}{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}\boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\intercal}\right] + O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{-1}+n^{-1}h^{-3})$$

$$n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mu\intercal}}\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^{-1}g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) = E\left[\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\intercal}\left\{1-\frac{I(T_j=k)}{\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}\right\}\frac{g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i)}{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}\boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\ddagger\intercal}\right] + O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{-1}+n^{-1}h^{-3})$$

for $k = 0, 1$.

Proof. We will show the first equality for the gradient with respect to $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\pi}$. The second equality is analogous. The general strategy is to write the left hand side as a V-statistic and apply the V-statistic projection lemma. We begin by simplifying the gradient itself.

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\pi\intercal}}\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^{-1} &= \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\pi\intercal}}\widehat{f}(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \widehat{f}(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\pi\intercal}}\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2}\\ &= n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\intercal}\frac{\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - I(T_j=k)\widehat{f}(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2}\boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\intercal}\end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into the left hand side:

$$\begin{aligned}n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\pi\intercal}}\frac{g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i)}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi},\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})} &= n^{-2}\sum_{i,j}\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\intercal}\frac{\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - I(T_j=k)\widehat{f}(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2}\boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\intercal}g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i)\\ &= n^{-2}\sum_{i,j}\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\intercal}\frac{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - I(T_j=k)f(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2}\boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\intercal}g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i)\\ &\quad + n^{-2}\sum_{i,j}\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\intercal}\frac{\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - I(T_j=k)\left\{\widehat{f}(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - f(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\right\}}{\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2}\boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\intercal}g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i)\\ &= n^{-2}\sum_{i,j}\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\intercal}\frac{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - I(T_j=k)f(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2}\boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\intercal}g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) + O_p(a_n)\end{aligned}$$

where the last step can be shown using the uniform convergence of the kernel estimators in the numerator:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{2} \sup_{\boldsymbol{X}_i \in \mathcal{X}} |\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - l(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})| = \sup_{\boldsymbol{X}_i \in \mathcal{X}} |\widehat{f}(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - f(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}))| = O_p(a_n),$$

and noting that the remaining double sum is $O_p(1)$. We now continue simplifying the main term to obtain a proper V-statistic:

$$\begin{aligned}
&n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}} \frac{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - I(T_j = k) f(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2} \boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\mathsf{T}} g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) \\
&\quad = n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}} \frac{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - I(T_j = k) f(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2} \boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\mathsf{T}} g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) \\
&\quad + n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}} \left\{ l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - I(T_j = k) f(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \right\} \boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\mathsf{T}} g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) \left\{ \frac{1}{\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2} - \frac{1}{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2} \right\} \\
&\quad = n^{-2} \sum_{i,j} \dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}} \frac{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - I(T_j = k) f(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2} \boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\mathsf{T}} g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) + O_p(a_n)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step can be shown using a similar argument as above by using uniform convergence of the kernel estimators in the numerator and noting that the remaining double sum is $O_p(1)$. We now define some terms to facilitate the application of the V-statistic projection lemma.

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{m}_{1,k}(\boldsymbol{Z}_j) &= E_{\boldsymbol{Z}_i} \left\{ \dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}} \frac{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - I(T_j = k) f(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2} \boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\mathsf{T}} g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) \right\} \\
\boldsymbol{m}_{2,k}(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) &= E_{\boldsymbol{Z}_j} \left\{ \dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}} \frac{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - I(T_j = k) f(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2} \boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\mathsf{T}} g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) \right\} \\
\boldsymbol{m}_k &= E \left\{ \dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}} \frac{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - I(T_j = k) f(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2} \boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\mathsf{T}} g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) \right\} \\
\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{1,k} &= n^{-1} E | \dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ii})^{\mathsf{T}} \frac{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - I(T_i = k) f(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2} \boldsymbol{X}_{ii}^{\dagger\mathsf{T}} g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) | \\
\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{2,k} &= n^{-1} \left(E \left[\left\{ \dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}} \frac{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - I(T_j = k) f(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2} \boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\mathsf{T}} g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) \right\}^2 \right] \right)^{1/2}
\end{aligned}$$

We now evaluate each of the terms. The first term can be simplified through a standard change-of-variables argument:

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{m}_{1,k}(\boldsymbol{Z}_j) &= E_{\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i}\left[\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^\intercal \frac{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i) - I(T_j = k)\bar{f}(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)^2} E\left\{\boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\intercal} g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i)|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i\right\}\right] \\
&= \int \dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j - \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)^\intercal \left\{1 - \frac{I(T_j = k)}{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)}\right\} \frac{1}{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)} E\left\{\boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\intercal} g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i)|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i = \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1\right\} d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1 \\
&= h^{-1} \int \dot{K}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_j)^\intercal \left\{1 - \frac{I(T_j = k)}{\bar{\pi}_k(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_j + \bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)}\right\} \frac{1}{\bar{\pi}_k(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_j + \bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)} E\left\{\boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\intercal} g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i)|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i = h\boldsymbol{\psi}_j + \bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j\right\} d\boldsymbol{\psi}_j \\
&= O(h^{-1})
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step can be shown from bounding the integrand, using that $\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}})$ is bounded away from 0, $E\left\{\boldsymbol{X}_i g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i)|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i = \boldsymbol{s}\right\}$ and $E\left\{g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i)|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i = \boldsymbol{s}\right\}$ are continuous over a compact support, and the integrability of $\dot{K}(\boldsymbol{u})$. Similarly for the second term:

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{m}_{2,k}(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) &= E_{\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j}\left[\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^\intercal E\left\{(1 - \frac{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)}{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)})\boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\intercal}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j\right\} \frac{g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i)}{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\right] \\
&= h^{-1} \int \dot{K}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_i)^\intercal E\left\{(1 - \frac{\bar{\pi}_k(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_i + \bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)})\boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\intercal}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j = h\boldsymbol{\psi}_i + \bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i\right\} \frac{g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i)}{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)} \bar{f}(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_i + \bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i) d\boldsymbol{\psi}_i \\
&= O(h^{-1})
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step can be shown by bounding the integrand, using that $\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}})$ is bounded away from 0, $\bar{f}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}})$ is bounded, $\boldsymbol{X}$ is bounded, and the integrability of $\dot{K}(\boldsymbol{u})$. For the last terms, note that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1 &= n^{-1} E|\dot{K}_h(\boldsymbol{0})^\intercal \frac{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - I(T_j = k) f(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2} \boldsymbol{0} g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i)| = \boldsymbol{0} \\
\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_2 &= n^{-1}\left(E\left[\left\{\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^\intercal \frac{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - I(T_j = k) f(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2} \boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\intercal} g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i)\right\}^2\right]\right)^{1/2} = O(n^{-1}h^{-3})
\end{aligned}$$

where the order of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_2$ can be found by bounding terms in the expectation, using that $\dot{K}(\boldsymbol{u})$ is bounded, $l_k(\boldsymbol{x}; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ is bounded and bounded away from 0, $f(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ is bounded, and $\boldsymbol{X}$ is

bounded. Finally, application of the projection lemma yields:

$$\begin{aligned} n^{-2}\sum_{i,j}\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}}\frac{l(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})-T_j f(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{l(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2}\boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) \\ = \boldsymbol{m}_k + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\boldsymbol{m}_{1,k}(\boldsymbol{Z}_j) - \boldsymbol{m}_k + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}m_{2,k}(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) - \boldsymbol{m}_k + O_p(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1+\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_2) \\ = \boldsymbol{m}_k + O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{-1}) + O_p(n^{-1}h^{-3}) \end{aligned}$$

for $k = 0, 1$, where the last line follows from application of Lemma 1. Collecting all the results from above we obtain the desired equality. □

The next lemma shows that the normalizing constant in the IPW is 1 up to some lower order terms, which will allow us to account for the normalization in the expansion. The approach to analyzing this constant also parallels that of the main expansion.

Lemma 3. *Under the assumptions listed above, the normalizing constant is:*

$$n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\widehat{\omega}_{ik} = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{I(T_i=k)}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})} = 1 + O_p(a_n)$$

for $k = 0, 1$.

Proof. We begin by decomposing the sum:

$$\begin{aligned} n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\widehat{\omega}_{ik} &= n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\bar{\omega}_{ik} + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\{\frac{1}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})} - \frac{1}{\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}\right\}I(T_i=k) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\{\frac{1}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})} - \frac{1}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}\right\}I(T_i=k) \\ &= \widehat{S}_{1,k} + \widehat{S}_{2,k} + \widehat{S}_{3,k} \end{aligned}$$

for $k = 0, 1$. The first term is:

$$\widehat{S}_{1,k} = 1 + n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{I(T_i=k)}{\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})} - 1\right) = 1 + O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

The second term can be controlled:

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\widehat{S}_{2,k}| &= |n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})-\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}I(T_i=k)| \\
&\leq \sup_{\boldsymbol{X}_i\in\mathcal{X}}|\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})-\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})|n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{I(T_i=k)}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})} = O_p(a_n)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last step follows from applying the uniform convergence of $\widehat{\pi}$ and noting the remaining double sum is $O_p(1)$. The third term can be written:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widehat{S}_{3,k} &= n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\{\frac{1}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi},\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})}-\frac{1}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi},\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})}+\frac{1}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi},\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})}-\frac{1}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi},\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})}\right\}I(T_i=k) \\
&= n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\pi\mathsf{T}}}\frac{1}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi},\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}-\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi})+\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mu\mathsf{T}}}\frac{1}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi},\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu}-\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})\right\}I(T_i=k) \\
&\quad + O_p(||\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}-\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}||^2+||\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu}-\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu}||^2) \\
&= n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\pi\mathsf{T}}}\frac{1}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi},\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}-\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi})+\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mu\mathsf{T}}}\frac{1}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi},\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu}-\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})\right\}I(T_i=k) \\
&\quad + O_p(||\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}-\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}||^2+||\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu}-\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu}||^2+||\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}-\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}||||\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu}-\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu}||)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the second and third equalities can be shown using that $\partial\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\boldsymbol{\beta})^{-1}/\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\pi\mathsf{T}}$ and $\partial\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\boldsymbol{\beta})^{-1}/\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mu\mathsf{T}}$ are Lipshitz continuous in $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, which follows from that $\dot{K}(\boldsymbol{u})$ is Lipshitz continuous in $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{x};\boldsymbol{\beta})$ and $\widehat{f}(\boldsymbol{x};\boldsymbol{\beta})$ are Lipschitz continuous in $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. To simplify the average of the gradients, we apply Lemma 2, taking $g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i)=I(T_i=k)$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\pi\mathsf{T}}}\frac{I(T_i=k)}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi},\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})} &= E\left[\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}}\left\{1-\frac{I(T_j=k)}{\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}\right\}\frac{I(T_i=k)}{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}\boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}\right] \\
&\quad + O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{-1}+n^{-1}h^{-3})
\end{aligned}
$$

where:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E\left[\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}}\left\{1-\frac{I(T_j=k)}{\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}\right\}\frac{I(T_i=k)}{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}\boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}\right] \\
&= E\Bigg(\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}}\frac{1}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\Big[\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\left\{E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)-E(\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i,T_i=k)\right\} \\
&\qquad -\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)\left\{E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j,T_j=k)-E(\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i,T_i=k)\right\}\Big]\Bigg) \\
&= \int\int h^{-1}\dot{K}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_1)^{\mathsf{T}}\frac{\bar{f}(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_1+\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)}{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)}\Big[\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)\left\{E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j=h\boldsymbol{\psi}_1+\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)-E(\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i=\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1,T_i=k)\right\} \\
&\qquad -\bar{\pi}_k(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_1+\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)\left\{E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j=h\boldsymbol{\psi}_1+\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1,T_j=k)-E(\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i=\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1,T_i=k)\right\}\Big]d\boldsymbol{\psi}_1 d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1 \\
&= O(h^{-1})
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last step can be shown by bounding the integrand using that $\bar{f}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}})$, $\pi_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}})$, and $\boldsymbol{X}$ are bounded, $\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}})$ is bounded away from 0, and $\dot{K}(\boldsymbol{u})$ is integrable. Analogously applying Lemma 2 to the gradient with respect to $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mu}$ with $g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i)=I(T_i=k)$ we have:

$$
n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mu\mathsf{T}}}\frac{I(T_i=k)}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi},\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})}=O(h^{-1})+O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{-1}+n^{-1}h^{-3})
$$

Collecting all the results from above we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{I(T_i=k)}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})} &= 1+O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})+O_p(a_n)+O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{-1}+n^{-1}h^{-1}+n^{-3/2}h^{-3}+n^{-1}) \\
&= 1+O_p(a_n)
\end{aligned}
$$

□

B.2 Expansion of $\widehat{W}_k$

The approach for the asymptotic expansion will be to decompose $\widehat{W}_k$ into separate terms and then separately analyze each term. In particular, analysis of the second and third terms proceeds by first writing them in terms of V-statistics and then applying the V-statistic projection lemma, as in the above lemmas. We begin by showing that using the

normalizing constant in the IPW effectively contributes a $O_p(a_n)$ term to the expansion.

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{W}_k &= n^{\frac{1}{2}}(\widehat{\mu}_k - \bar{\mu}_k) = n^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\omega}_{ik}\right)^{-1}\left\{n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)\right\} \\ &= n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k) + \left[\{1 + O_p(a_n)\}^{-1} - 1\right] n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k) \\ &= \widetilde{W}_k + O_p(a_n)\widetilde{W}_k\end{aligned}$$

where we use Lemma 3 in the second to last step. We will show that $\widetilde{W}_k = O_p(1)$ so that the remainder $O_p(a_n)\widetilde{W}_k = O_p(a_n)$. We now write:

$$\widetilde{W}_k = \widetilde{W}_{1,k} + \widetilde{W}_{2,k} + \widetilde{W}_{3,k}$$

where $\widetilde{W}_{1,k} = n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\omega}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)$,

$$\widetilde{W}_{2,k} = n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n (\frac{\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})} - 1)\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)$$

$$\text{and} \quad \widetilde{W}_{3,k} = n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n (\frac{1}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})} - \frac{1}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})})I(T_i = k)(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)$$

B.3 Expansion of $\widetilde{W}_{2,k}$

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{W}_{2,k} &= -n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \widehat{f}(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k) \\ &= -n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \widehat{f}(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k) \\ &\quad - n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n \left\{\frac{1}{\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})} - \frac{1}{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}\right\}\left\{\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \widehat{f}(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\right\}\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k) \\ &= -n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \widehat{f}(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k) + O_p(n^{\frac{1}{2}}a_n^2) \\ &= \widetilde{\widetilde{W}}_{2,k} + O_p(n^{\frac{1}{2}}a_n^2)\end{aligned}$$

where the second to last step can be shown by using the uniform convergence of of $\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \widehat{f}(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ and $\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$. We now decompose $\widetilde{\widetilde{W}}_{2,k}$ further into centered and non-centered $n^{\frac{1}{2}}$-scaled V-statistics:

$$\widetilde{\widetilde{W}}_{2,k} = -n^{\frac{1}{2}}n^{-2}\sum_{i,j} K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})\left\{I(T_j = k) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\right\}\frac{\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)} = \widetilde{\widetilde{W}}_{1,2,k} + \widetilde{\widetilde{W}}_{2,2,k}$$

where:

$$\widetilde{\widetilde{W}}_{1,2,k} = -n^{\frac{1}{2}}n^{-2}\sum_{i,j} K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})\left\{I(T_j = k) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)\right\}\frac{\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}$$

$$\text{and} \quad \widetilde{\widetilde{W}}_{2,2,k} - n^{\frac{1}{2}}n^{-2}\sum_{i,j} K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})\left\{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\right\}\frac{\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}$$

We now prepare to apply the projection lemma to each of these terms. For the centered V-statistic $\widetilde{\widetilde{W}}_{1,2,k}$, define the following:

$$m_{1,1,2,k}(\boldsymbol{Z}_j) = E_{\boldsymbol{Z}_i}\left[K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})\left\{I(T_j = k) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)\right\}\frac{\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\right]$$

$$m_{2,1,2,k}(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) = E_{\boldsymbol{Z}_j}\left[K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})\left\{I(T_j = k) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)\right\}\frac{\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\right]$$

$$m_{1,2,k} = E\left[K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})\left\{I(T_j = k) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)\right\}\frac{\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\right]$$

$$\varepsilon_{1,1,2,k} = n^{-1}E|K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ii})\left\{I(T_i = k) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\right\}\frac{\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}|$$

$$\varepsilon_{2,1,2,k} = n^{-1}\left\{E\left(\left[K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})\left\{I(T_j = k) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)\right\}\frac{\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\right]^2\right)\right\}^{1/2}$$

Now we evaluate each of these terms. The first term can be obtained through a standard

change-of-variables argument:

$$
\begin{aligned}
m_{1,1,2,k}(\boldsymbol{Z}_j) &= E_{\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i}\left[K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})\left\{I(T_j=k)-\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)\right\}\frac{E(Y_i|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i,T_i=k)-\bar{\mu}_k}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\right] \\
&= \int K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j-\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)\left\{I(T_j=k)-\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)\right\}\frac{E(Y_i|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i=\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1,T_i=k)-\bar{\mu}_k}{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)}d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1 \\
&= \int K(\boldsymbol{\psi}_j)\bar{\xi}_k(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_j+\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)\left\{I(T_j=k)-\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)\right\}d\boldsymbol{\psi}_j \\
&= \int K(\boldsymbol{\psi}_j)\left\{\bar{\xi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)+h\boldsymbol{\psi}_j^{\intercal}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{s}}\bar{\xi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)+\ldots+\frac{h^q}{q!}\boldsymbol{\psi}_j^{\otimes q}\otimes\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{s}^{\otimes q}}\bar{\xi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j^*)\right\}d\boldsymbol{\psi}_j\left\{I(T_j=k)-\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)\right\} \\
&= \left\{\bar{\xi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)+O_p(h^q)\right\}\left\{I(T_j=k)-\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)\right\} \\
&= E(Y_i-\bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i=\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j,T_i=k)\left\{\bar{\omega}_{jk}-1\right\}+O_p(h^q)\left\{I(T_j=k)-\pi_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\bar{\xi}_k(\boldsymbol{s}) = E(Y_i-\bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i=\boldsymbol{s},T_i=k)/\bar{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{s})$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j^*$ is an intermediate such that $||\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j^*-\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j|| \leq ||h\boldsymbol{\psi}_j||$. In the second to last step, we bound the remainder term using that $E(Y|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}=\boldsymbol{s},T=k)$ and $\bar{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{s})$ are q-times continuously differentiable for $k=0,1$ and $\mathcal{X}$ is compact. Due to the centering in this first V-statistic:

$$
\begin{aligned}
m_{2,1,2,k}(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) &= E_{\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j}\left[K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})\left\{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)-\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)\right\}\frac{\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i-\bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\right]=0 \\
m_{1,2,k} &= E_{\boldsymbol{Z}_i}\left\{m_{2,1,2,k}(\boldsymbol{Z}_i)\right\}=0
\end{aligned}
$$

For the error terms:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon_{1,1,2,k} &= n^{-1}h^{-2}K(\boldsymbol{0})E\left\{|I(T_i=k)-\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)|\frac{\bar{\omega}_{ik}|Y_i-\bar{\mu}_k|}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\right\}=O(n^{-1}h^{-2}) \\
\varepsilon_{2,1,2,k} &= n^{-1}\left\{E\left(\left[K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})\left\{I(T_j=k)-\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)\right\}\frac{I(T_i=k)(Y_i-\bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\right]^2\right)\right\}^{1/2}=O(n^{-1}h^{-2})
\end{aligned}
$$

which can be shown by bounding terms inside the expectations using that $E(Y|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}=\boldsymbol{s},T=k)$ and $E(Y^2|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}=\boldsymbol{s},T=k)$ are continuous, $\mathcal{X}$ is compact, $\bar{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{s})$ and $\bar{l}_k(\boldsymbol{s})$ are bounded and bounded away from 0, and $K(\boldsymbol{u})$ is bounded. By application of the projection lemma,

the first V-statistic can now be written:

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\widetilde{W}}_{1,2,k} &= -n^{\frac{1}{2}}\left\{n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{n} m_{1,1,2,k}(\boldsymbol{Z}_j) + n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_{2,1,2,k}(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) - m_{1,2,k} + O_p(\varepsilon_{1,1,2,k} + \varepsilon_{2,1,2,k})\right\} \\ &= -n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sum_{j=1}^{n} E(Y|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}} = \bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j, T = k)(\frac{I(T_j = k)}{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)} - 1) + O_p(h^q) + O_p(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}h^2})\end{aligned}$$

For the non-centered V-statistic $\widetilde{\widetilde{W}}_{2,2,k}$, define the following:

$$\begin{aligned}m_{1,2,2,k}(\boldsymbol{Z}_j) &= E_{\boldsymbol{Z}_i}\left[K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})\left\{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\right\}\frac{\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\right] \\ m_{2,2,2,k}(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) &= E_{\boldsymbol{Z}_j}\left[K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})\left\{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\right\}\frac{\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\right] \\ m_{2,2,k} &= E\left[K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})\left\{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\right\}\frac{\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\right] \\ \varepsilon_{1,2,2,k} &= n^{-1}E|K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ii})\left\{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\right\}\frac{\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}| \\ \varepsilon_{2,2,2,k} &= n^{-1}\left\{E\left(\left[K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})\left\{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\right\}\frac{\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\right]^2\right)\right\}^{1/2}\end{aligned}$$

We now evaluate each of these terms. For the first term we have:

$$\begin{aligned}&m_{1,2,2,k}(\boldsymbol{Z}_j) = E_{\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i}\left[K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})\left\{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\right\}\frac{E(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i, T_i = k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\right] \\ &= \int K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j - \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)\left\{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)\right\}\bar{\xi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1 \\ &= \int K(\boldsymbol{\psi}_j)\left\{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j) - \bar{\pi}_k(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_j + \bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)\right\}\bar{\xi}_k(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_j + \bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)d\boldsymbol{\psi}_j \\ &= \int K(\boldsymbol{\psi}_j)\left\{-h\boldsymbol{\psi}_j^{\mathsf{T}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}}\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j) - \frac{h^2}{2!}\boldsymbol{\psi}_j^{\mathsf{T}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}^{\otimes 2}}\bar{\pi}(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)\boldsymbol{\psi}_j - \ldots - \frac{h^q}{q!}\boldsymbol{\psi}_j^{\otimes q}\otimes\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}^{\otimes q}}\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j^*)\right\}\bar{\xi}(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_j + \bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)d\boldsymbol{\psi}_j \\ &= O_p(h^q)\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}^*$ is such that $||\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j^* - \bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j|| \leq ||h\boldsymbol{\psi}_j||$. The last step can be shown by bounding the remainder term by using that $\bar{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{s})$ is q-times continuously differentiable, $\bar{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{s})$ and

$E(Y|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}} = \boldsymbol{s}, T = k)$ are continuous, and $\mathcal{X}$ is compact. Similarly for the second term:

$$\begin{aligned}
m_{2,2,2,k}(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) &= E_{\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j}\left[K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})\left\{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\right\}\frac{\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\right] \\
&= \int K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2 - \bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\left\{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\right\}\frac{\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\bar{f}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2)d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2 \\
&= \int K(\boldsymbol{\psi}_i)\left\{\bar{\pi}_k(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_i + \bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\right\}\bar{f}(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_i + \bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)d\boldsymbol{\psi}_i\frac{\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)} \\
&= \int K(\boldsymbol{\psi}_i)\left\{h\boldsymbol{\psi}_i^{\mathsf{T}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}}\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i) + \ldots + \frac{h^q}{q!}\boldsymbol{\psi}_i^{\otimes q} \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}^{\otimes q}}\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i^*)\right\}\bar{f}(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_i + \bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)d\boldsymbol{\psi}_i\frac{\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)} \\
&= O_p(h^q)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step can be shown by bounding the remainder term using that $\bar{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{s})$ is q-times continuously differentiable, $\bar{f}(\boldsymbol{s})$ is continuous, and $\mathcal{X}$ is compact. The errors are:

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon_{1,2,2,k} &= n^{-1}E|K_h(\boldsymbol{0})0\frac{I(T_i = k)(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}| = 0 \\
\varepsilon_{2,2,2,k} &= n^{-1}\left\{E\left(\left[K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})\left\{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\right\}\frac{\bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\right]^2\right)\right\}^{1/2} = O(n^{-1}h^{-2})
\end{aligned}$$

where the order of the second error can be shown by bounding terms in the expectation using that $E(Y^2|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}} = \boldsymbol{s}, T = k)$ is continuous, $\mathcal{X}$ is compact, $\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}})$ and $\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}})$ are bounded and bounded away from 0, and $K(\boldsymbol{u})$ is bounded. Upon application of the projection lemma, the second V-statistic can now be written:

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\widetilde{W}}_{2,2,k} &= -n^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big[n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\{m_{1,2,2,k}(\boldsymbol{Z}_j) - m_{2,2,k}\right\} + n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\{m_{2,2,2,k}(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) - m_{2,2,k}\right\} \\
&\qquad\qquad + m_{2,2,k} + O_p(\varepsilon_{1,2,2,k} + \varepsilon_{2,2,2,k})\Big] \\
&= O_p(h^q) - n^{\frac{1}{2}}m_{2,2,k} + O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{-2})
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from application of Lemma 1. To complete the analysis of $\widetilde{\widetilde{W}}_{2,k}$, it remains for us to identify the order of $\sqrt{n}m_{2,2,k}$. We evaluate $m_{2,2,k}$ using a similar

approach.

$$
\begin{aligned}
m_{2,2,k} &= E\left[K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})\left\{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\right\}\frac{E(Y_i|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i, T_i = k) - \bar{\mu}_k}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\right] \\
&= \int\int K_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_{21})\left\{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)\right\}\bar{\xi}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)\bar{f}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2)d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2 d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1 \\
&= \int\int K(\boldsymbol{\psi}_1)\left\{\bar{\pi}_k(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_1 + \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)\right\}\bar{f}(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_1 + \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)d\boldsymbol{\psi}_1\bar{\xi}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1 \\
&= \int\int K(\boldsymbol{\psi}_1)\left\{h\boldsymbol{\psi}_1^{\mathsf{T}}\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}}\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1) + \ldots + \frac{h^q}{q!}\boldsymbol{\psi}_1^{\otimes q} \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}^{\otimes q}}\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1^*)\right\}\bar{f}(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_1 + \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)d\boldsymbol{\psi}_1\bar{\xi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1 \\
&= O(h^q)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last step can be shown by bounding the remainder term using that $\bar{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{s})$ is q-times continuously differentiable, $\bar{f}(\boldsymbol{s})$ is continuous, and $\mathcal{X}$ is compact. The second V-statistic is now of the order:

$$
\widetilde{\widetilde{W}}_{2,2,k} = O_p(h^q) + O_p(n^{\frac{1}{2}}h^q) + O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{-2})
$$

B.4 Expansion of $\widetilde{W}_{3,k}$

The third term can be written:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{W}_{3,k} &= n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\{\frac{1}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})} - \frac{1}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})}\right\} I(T_i = k)(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k) \\
&= n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\pi\mathsf{T}}}\frac{1}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mu\mathsf{T}}}\frac{1}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})\right\} I(T_i = k)(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k) \\
&\quad + O_p\left\{n^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(||\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}||^2 + ||\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu}||^2\right)\right\} \\
&= n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\pi\mathsf{T}}}\frac{I(T_i = k)(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})}n^{\frac{1}{2}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}) + n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mu\mathsf{T}}}\frac{I(T_i = k)(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})}n^{\frac{1}{2}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu}) \\
&\quad + O_p\left\{n^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(||\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}||^2 + ||\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu}||^2 + ||\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}||||\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu}||\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

using that $\partial\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\boldsymbol{\beta})^{-1}/\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\pi\mathsf{T}}$ and $\partial\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i;\boldsymbol{\beta})^{-1}/\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mu\mathsf{T}}$ are Lipshitz continuous in $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, which follows from that $\dot{K}(\boldsymbol{u})$ is Lipshitz continuous in $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $\widehat{l}_k(\boldsymbol{x};\boldsymbol{\beta})$ and $\widehat{f}(\boldsymbol{x};\boldsymbol{\beta})$ are Lipschitz continuous in $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

Applying Lemma 2 taking $g(\boldsymbol{Z}_i) = I(T_i = k)(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_1)$ we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\pi\mathsf{T}}} \frac{I(T_i = k)(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})} \\
&\quad = E\left[\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}} \left\{1 - \frac{I(T_j = k)}{\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}\right\} \frac{I(T_i = k)(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})} \boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}\right] + O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{-1} + n^{-1}h^{-3}) \\
&\quad = \widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_k^{\pi\mathsf{T}} + O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{-1} + n^{-1}h^{-3}) \\
&\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mu\mathsf{T}}} \frac{I(T_i = k)(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{\widehat{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\pi}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\mu})} \\
&\quad = E\left[\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}} \left\{1 - \frac{I(T_j = k)}{\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}\right\} \frac{I(T_i = k)(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)}{l_k(\boldsymbol{X}_i; \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})} \boldsymbol{X}_{ji}^{\ddagger\mathsf{T}}\right] + O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{-1} + n^{-1}h^{-3}) \\
&\quad = \widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_k^{\mu\mathsf{T}} + O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{-1} + n^{-1}h^{-3})
\end{aligned}
$$

for $k = 0, 1$. Let $\boldsymbol{v}_k^{\pi} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_k^{\pi}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}_k^{\mu} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_k^{\mu}$ denote the limiting values. It remains for us to verify that $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_k^{\pi}$ and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_k^{\mu}$ are $O(1)$ in general, $\boldsymbol{v}_k^{\mu} = \boldsymbol{0}^{\mathsf{T}}$ when the PS model is correctly specified, and $\boldsymbol{v}_k^{\pi} = \boldsymbol{v}_k^{\mu} = \boldsymbol{0}$ when both the PS and response models are correctly specified, for $k = 0, 1$.

We first consider the general case, in which we can first further simplify the mean.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_k^{\pi\mathsf{T}} &= E\Bigg(\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}} \frac{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i) - I(T_j = k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)} \\
&\qquad \cdot \Big[E(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i, T_i = k)\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\dagger\mathsf{T}} - E\left\{(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i, T_i = k\right\}\Big]\Bigg) \\
&= E\Bigg(\frac{\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}}}{\bar{f}(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)} \Big[E(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i, T_i = k)E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j) - E\left\{(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i, T_i = k\right\}\Big] \\
&\quad - \dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}} \frac{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)} \Big[E(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i, T_i = k)E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j, T_j = k) - E\left\{(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i, T_i = k\right\}\Big]\Bigg)
\end{aligned}
$$

which can be expressed in the form:

$$
\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_k^{\pi\mathsf{T}} = E\left\{\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}} \sum_{u=1}^{4} \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{1,u,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{2,u,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)\right\} = \sum_{u=1}^{4} E\left\{\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}} \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{1,u,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{2,u,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)\right\}
$$

where:

$$\bar{\zeta}_{1,1,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i) = \frac{E(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i, T_i = k)}{\bar{f}(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)} \quad \bar{\zeta}_{2,1,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j) = E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)$$

$$\bar{\zeta}_{1,2,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i) = -\frac{E\left\{(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i, T_i = k\right\}}{\bar{f}(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)} \quad \bar{\zeta}_{2,2,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j) = 1$$

$$\bar{\zeta}_{1,3,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i) = -\frac{E(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i, T_i = k)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)} \quad \bar{\zeta}_{2,3,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j) = \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j, T_j = k)$$

$$\bar{\zeta}_{1,4,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i) = \frac{E\left\{(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k)\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i, T_i = k\right\}}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)} \quad \bar{\zeta}_{2,4,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j) = \pi_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)$$

Each of the four terms can be simplified using a change-of-variables argument:

$$E\left\{\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}}\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{1,u,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{2,u,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)\right\} = \int\int \dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_{21})^{\mathsf{T}}\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}'_{1,u,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}'_{2,u,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2)d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1 d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2$$
$$= \int\int h^{-1}\dot{K}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_2)^{\mathsf{T}}\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}'_{1,u,k}(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_2 + \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}'_{2,u,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2)d\boldsymbol{\psi}_2 d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2$$

where $\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}'_{1,u,k}(\boldsymbol{s}) = \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{1,u,k}(\boldsymbol{s})\bar{f}(\boldsymbol{s})$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}'_{2,u,k}(\boldsymbol{s}) = \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_{2,u,k}(\boldsymbol{s})\bar{f}(\boldsymbol{s})$. Let $\dot{K}(\boldsymbol{u}) = (\dot{K}(\boldsymbol{u})_{[1]}, \dot{K}(\boldsymbol{u})_{[2]})^{\mathsf{T}}$ be the partial derivatives of $K(\boldsymbol{u})$ with respect to the first and second components of $\boldsymbol{u}$ evaluated at $\boldsymbol{u}$, and let $\left\{\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}'_{1,u,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}'_{2,u,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2)\right\}_{[i,j]}$ denote the (i,j)-th component of $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,u,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{2,u,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2)$ evaluated at $\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2$, for $i = 1, 2$ and $j = 1, \ldots, p+1$. Applying integration by parts we can write the j-th element of the expectation above as:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2}\int\int h^{-1}\dot{K}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_2)_{[i]}\left\{\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}'_{1,u,k}(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_2 + \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}'_{2,u,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2)\right\}_{[i,j]}d\boldsymbol{\psi}_2 d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2$$
$$= -\sum_{i=1}^{2}\int\int K(\boldsymbol{\psi}_2)\frac{\partial}{\partial\psi_{2i}}\left[\left\{\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}'_{1,u,k}(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_2 + \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}'_{2,u,k}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2)\right\}_{[i,j]}\right]d\boldsymbol{\psi}_2 d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2 = O(1)$$

The last equality can be shown by bounding the integrand using that $E(Y|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}} = \boldsymbol{s}, T = k)$, $E(\boldsymbol{X}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}} = \boldsymbol{s})$, $E(\boldsymbol{X}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}} = \boldsymbol{s}, T = k)$, and $E(\boldsymbol{X}Y|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}} = \boldsymbol{s}, T = k)$ are continuously differentiable, $\mathcal{X}$ is compact, and $\bar{f}(\boldsymbol{s})$ and $\bar{l}_k(\boldsymbol{s})$ are bounded away from 0. This shows that $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_k^{\pi} = O(1)$ for $k = 0, 1$ in general. Applying the same argument it can be shown that in general $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_k^{\mu} = O(1)$ for $k = 0, 1$ as well.

Now consider the case where the PS model is correct. We can write $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_k^{\mu}$ as:

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_k^{\mu} = E_{\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i,\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j}\Bigg(\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}}\frac{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\Big[E(Y_i-\bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i,T_i=k)E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\ddagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j) - E\Big\{(Y_i-\bar{\mu}_k)\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\ddagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i,T_i=k\Big\}\Big]$$
$$- \dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}}\frac{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\Big[E(Y_i-\bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i,T_i=k)E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\ddagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j,T_j=k) - E\Big\{(Y_i-\bar{\mu}_k)\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\ddagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i,T_i=k\Big\}\Big]\Bigg)$$
$$= E_{\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i,\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j}\Bigg(\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^{\mathsf{T}}\frac{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)-\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\Big[E(Y_i^{(k)}-\bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\ddagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j) - E\Big\{(Y_i^{(k)}-\bar{\mu}_k)\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\ddagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i,T_i=k\Big\}\Big]\Bigg)$$

where the second equality follows from using that $\boldsymbol{X}\perp T|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}$ and $Y^{(k)}\perp T|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}$ when the PS model is correctly specified. Now evaluate this expectation:

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_k^{\mu} = \int\int \dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_{21})^{\mathsf{T}}\frac{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)-\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2)}{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)}\bar{f}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2)\big[E(Y_i^{(k)}-\bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i=\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\ddagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j=\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2)$$
$$- E\Big\{(Y_i^{(k)}-\bar{\mu}_k)\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\ddagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i=\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1,T_i=k\Big\}\big]d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2 d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1$$
$$= \int\int h^{-1}\dot{K}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_1)^{\mathsf{T}}\frac{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)-\bar{\pi}_k(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_1+\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)}{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)}\bar{f}(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_1+\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)\Big[E(Y_i^{(k)}-\bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i=\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)$$
$$\cdot E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\ddagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j=h\boldsymbol{\psi}_1+\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1) - E\Big\{(Y_i^{(k)}-\bar{\mu}_k)\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\ddagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i=\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1,T_i=k\Big\}\Big]d\boldsymbol{\psi}_1 d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1$$
$$= -\int\int \dot{K}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_1)^{\mathsf{T}}\frac{\boldsymbol{\psi}_1^{\mathsf{T}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{s}}\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)+h\boldsymbol{\psi}_1^{\mathsf{T}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{s}^{\otimes 2}}\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1^*)\boldsymbol{\psi}_1}{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)}\Big\{\bar{f}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)+h\boldsymbol{\psi}_1^{\mathsf{T}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{s}}\bar{f}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1^{**})\Big\}$$
$$\cdot\Big[E(Y_i^{(k)}-\bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i=\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)\Big\{E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\ddagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j=\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)+h\boldsymbol{\psi}_1\otimes\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{s}}E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\ddagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j=\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1^{***})\Big\}$$
$$- E\Big\{(Y_i^{(k)}-\bar{\mu}_k)\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\ddagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i=\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1,T_i=k\Big\}\Big]d\boldsymbol{\psi}_1 d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1$$
$$= -\int\int \dot{K}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_1)^{\mathsf{T}}\frac{\boldsymbol{\psi}_1^{\mathsf{T}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{s}}\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)}{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)}\bar{f}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)\Big[E(Y_i^{(k)}-\bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i=\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\ddagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j=\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)$$
$$- E\Big\{(Y_i^{(k)}-\bar{\mu}_k)\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\ddagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i=\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1,T_i=k\Big\}\Big]d\boldsymbol{\psi}_1 d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1 + O(h)$$

where $\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1^*$, $\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1^{**}$, and $\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1^{***}$ are intermediate values between $h\boldsymbol{\psi}_1+\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1$. The last step can be shown by bounding the integrand, using that $\dot{K}(\boldsymbol{u})$ is bounded, $\bar{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{s})$ is twice continuously differentiable, $\bar{f}(\boldsymbol{s})$ and $E(\boldsymbol{X}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}=\boldsymbol{s})$ are continuously differentiable, and $E(Y|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}=\boldsymbol{s},T=k)$ and $E(Y\boldsymbol{X}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}=\boldsymbol{s},T=k)$ are continuous, and $\mathcal{X}$ is compact. After

some rearrangement, the main term can be further simplified:

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_k^{\mu\mathsf{T}} &= -\int \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}^\mathsf{T}}\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)}{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)}\bar{f}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)\int \boldsymbol{\psi}_1\dot{K}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_1)^\mathsf{T}d\boldsymbol{\psi}_1\Big[E(Y_i^{(k)}-\bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i=\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\ddagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j=\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1) \\
&\qquad\qquad - E\left\{(Y_i^{(k)}-\bar{\mu}_k)\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\ddagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i=\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1,T_i=k\right\}\Big]d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1+O(h) \\
&= -E\left(\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}^\mathsf{T}}\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}\left[E(Y^{(k)}-\bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)E(\boldsymbol{X}^{\ddagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)-E\left\{(Y^{(k)}-\bar{\mu}_k)\boldsymbol{X}^{\ddagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i,T=k\right\}\right]\right)+O(h) \\
&= \mathbf{0}^\mathsf{T}+O(h)
\end{aligned}$$

where the second to last step can be shown using $\int \boldsymbol{\psi}_1\dot{K}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_1)^\mathsf{T}d\boldsymbol{\psi}_1 = \boldsymbol{I}_{2\times 2}$ by integration by parts. Let the partial derivatives of $\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}})$ with respect to the first and second arguments, evaluated at $\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}$, be denoted by $\partial\bar{\pi}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}})/\partial\boldsymbol{s}^\mathsf{T} = (\partial\bar{\pi}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}})/\partial s_1, \partial\bar{\pi}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}})/\partial s_2)$. The last equality can be shown using that $\partial\bar{\pi}(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)/\partial s_2 = 0$ since $\bar{\pi}(\boldsymbol{s})$ depends only on its first argument when the PS model is correct. This shows that $\boldsymbol{v}_k^\mu = \mathbf{0}$ for $k = 0, 1$ when the PS model is correct.

Finally we consider the case where the response model, in addition to the PS model, is correctly specified. We can write $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_k^{\pi\mathsf{T}}$ in this case as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_k^{\pi\mathsf{T}} &= E\Bigg(\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^\mathsf{T}\frac{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)-\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)} \\
&\qquad\qquad \cdot\left[E(Y_i^{(k)}-\bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)-E\left\{(Y_i^{(k)}-\bar{\mu}_k)\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i,T_i=k\right\}\right]\Bigg) \\
&= E_{\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i,\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j}\left[\dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_{ji})^\mathsf{T}\frac{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)-\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)}{\bar{l}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)}E(Y_i^{(k)}-\bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\left\{E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j)-E(\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i)\right\}\right]
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $Y^{(k)} \perp \boldsymbol{X}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}, T = k$ when the response model is correct, and $\boldsymbol{X} \perp T|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}$

and $Y^{(k)} \perp T|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}$ when the PS model is correct. Evaluating this expectation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}_k^{\pi\mathsf{T}} &= \int\int \dot{K}_h(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_{21})^\mathsf{T} \frac{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1) - \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2)}{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)} E(Y_i^{(k)} - \bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i = \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1) \\
&\qquad \cdot \left\{ E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j = \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2) - E(\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i = \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1) \right\} \bar{f}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2) d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2 d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1 \\
&= \int\int h^{-1} \dot{K}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_1)^\mathsf{T} \frac{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1) - \bar{\pi}_k(h\boldsymbol{\psi}_1 + \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)}{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)} E(Y_i^{(k)} - \bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i = \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1) \\
&\qquad \cdot \left\{ E(\boldsymbol{X}_j^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_j = h\boldsymbol{\psi}_1 + \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1) - E(\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i = \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1) \right\} \bar{f}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2) d\boldsymbol{\psi}_1 d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1 \\
&= -h \int\int \dot{K}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_1)^\mathsf{T} \frac{\boldsymbol{\psi}_1^\mathsf{T} \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}} \bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1^*)}{\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1)} E(Y_i^{(k)} - \bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i = \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1) \boldsymbol{\psi}_1 \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{s}} E(\boldsymbol{X}_i^{\dagger\mathsf{T}}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i = \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1^{**}) \bar{f}(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_2) d\boldsymbol{\psi}_1 d\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1 \\
&= O(h)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1^*$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1^{**}$ are intermediate values between $h\boldsymbol{\psi}_1 + \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_1$. The last step can be shown by bounding various terms in the integrand, using that $\bar{\pi}_k(\bar{\boldsymbol{s}})$ is bounded away from 0, $\bar{\pi}_k(\boldsymbol{s})$ is continuously differentiable, $E(Y|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}} = \boldsymbol{s}, T = k)$ is continuous, $E(\boldsymbol{X}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}} = \boldsymbol{s})$ is continuously differentiable, $\bar{f}(\boldsymbol{s})$ is continuous, and $\mathcal{X}$ is compact. This shows that $\boldsymbol{v}_k^\pi = \boldsymbol{0}$ for $k = 0, 1$ when both the response and PS models are correct. The same argument can be used to show that $\boldsymbol{v}_k^\mu = \boldsymbol{0}$ for $k = 0, 1$ when both models are correct.

Collecting all the results from above, we find that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{W}_k &= n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \bar{\omega}_{ik}(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_k) - E(Y - \bar{\mu}_k|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i, T = k)(\bar{\omega}_{ik} - 1) \right\} \\
&\qquad + \boldsymbol{v}_k^{\pi\mathsf{T}} n^{\frac{1}{2}} (\widehat{\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}^\pi - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\pi) + \boldsymbol{v}_k^{\mu\mathsf{T}} n^{\frac{1}{2}} (\widehat{\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}^\mu - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\mu) + O_p(n^{\frac{1}{2}} h^q + n^{-\frac{1}{2}} h^{-2}) \\
&= n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[(Y_i^{(k)} - \bar{\mu}_k) + (\bar{\omega}_{ik} - 1) \left\{ Y_i^{(k)} - E(Y|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i, T = k) \right\} \right] \\
&\qquad + n^{\frac{1}{2}} (\widehat{\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}^\pi - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\pi)^\mathsf{T} \boldsymbol{v}_k^\pi + n^{\frac{1}{2}} (\widehat{\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}^\mu - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\mu)^\mathsf{T} \boldsymbol{v}_k^\mu + O_p(n^{\frac{1}{2}} h^q + n^{-\frac{1}{2}} h^{-2})
\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{v}_k^\pi$ and $\boldsymbol{v}_k^\mu$ are deterministic vectors such that $\boldsymbol{v}_k^\mu = \boldsymbol{0}$ when the PS model is correct and $\boldsymbol{v}_k^\pi = \boldsymbol{v}_k^\mu = \boldsymbol{0}$ when both the PS and response models are correct, for $k = 0, 1$. □

B.5 Proof of Corollary 1

Proof. Under the assumptions required for Theorem 1, $\widehat{\mu}_k - \bar{\mu}_k = O_p(n^{-1/2})$ when $h = O_p(n^{-\alpha})$ for $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2q}, \frac{1}{4})$. When the PS model is correct, $\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \pi_k(\boldsymbol{X})$ so that:

$$\bar{\mu}_k = E(\bar{\omega}_k Y) = E(\omega_k Y) = \mu_k$$

for $k = 0, 1$. When the response model is correct, $E(Y|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}, T = k) = E(Y|\boldsymbol{X}, T = k)$ so that:

$$\bar{\mu}_k = E(\bar{\omega}_k Y) = E\left\{E(Y^{(k)}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}, T = k)\right\} = E\left\{E(Y^{(k)}|\boldsymbol{X}, T = k)\right\} = \mu_k$$

for $k = 0, 1$. □

B.6 Proof of Corollary 2

Proof. Under the assumptions required for Theorem 1, when $h = O_p(n^{-\alpha})$ for $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2q}, \frac{1}{4})$ and both PS and response models are correct, we have that $\pi_k(\boldsymbol{X}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \pi_k(\boldsymbol{X})$, $E(Y^{(k)}|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}, T = k) = E(Y^{(k)}|\boldsymbol{X}, T = k)$, $\bar{\omega}_{ik} = \omega_{ik}$, and $\bar{\mu}_k = \mu_k$ for $k = 0, 1$ so that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{W}_k &= n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (Y_i^{(k)} - \bar{\mu}_k) + (\bar{\omega}_{ik} - 1)\left\{Y_i^{(k)} - E(Y|\bar{\boldsymbol{S}}_i, T = k)\right\} + o_p(1) \\
&= n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Psi_{ik}^{\text{eff}} + o_p(1)
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently the influence function for $\widehat{\Delta}$ can be written:

$$n^{1/2}(\widehat{\Delta} - \Delta) = \widehat{W}_1 - \widehat{W}_0 = n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Psi_i^{\text{eff}} + o_p(1)$$

where $\Psi_i^{\text{eff}} = \Psi_{i1}^{\text{eff}} - \Psi_{i0}^{\text{eff}}$ is the efficient influence function for Δ in a semiparametric model where the PS is correctly specified (Tsiatis, 2007). □